





THE LIBRARY  
OF  
THE UNIVERSITY  
OF CALIFORNIA

PRESENTED BY  
PROF. CHARLES A. KOFOID AND  
MRS. PRUDENCE W. KOFOID





Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2007 with funding from  
Microsoft Corporation



CHURCH AND NATION.

TO POLITICIANS OF ALL PARTIES,

THIS VOLUME

IS

DEDICATED.

(with many apologies).

*“ Have you learn'd lessons only of those who admired you,  
and were tender with you, and stood aside for you ?*

*Have you not learned great lessons from those who reject  
you, and brace themselves against you ? or who treat  
you with contempt, or dispute the passage with you ? ”*

—WALT WHITMAN.

# CHURCH AND NATION

OR

## WEALTH WITH HONOUR

(Including material to shew the need for a bold  
Constitutional advance as the alternative to an artificial  
Constitutional Crisis).

BY

ELLIOTT E. MILLS.  
"

---

*"United we stand, divided we fall."*

---

BATH :  
NATIONAL UNITY PRESS,  
19, UNION STREET.

---

LONDON :  
SIMPKIN, MARSHALL, HAMILTON, KENT & CO. LTD.  
1909.

[ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.]

PRINTED BY FYSON & Co. LTD.,  
19, UNION STREET AND UPPER BOROUGH WALLS,  
BATH.

## INTRODUCTION.

LORD BEACONSFIELD AND HIS SUCCESSORS :

OR

Author's apologies to so-called Liberalism  
and to Balfourian Liberalism.

---

IN submitting this volume to the public, a brief explanation as to the conditions under which it has been written is essential. From the time when he began to study English History, for his Oxford Degree, the writer had devoted prolonged thought to the curious fact that, despite our vast increase in wealth (since the coming of machinery in 1760), we have been unable to find any scientific device for eliminating undeserved poverty. It was not, however, till the autumn of 1907, that a close study of Lord Beaconsfield's speeches and novels, gave him the clue to the Neo-Catholic Movement advocated in these pages.

During the two years which have elapsed, he has been continuously engaged in casting and recasting the proposals in the present volume. Of the twelve chapters of which it is composed, I. to VII., the greater part of VIII. and IX., and the latter half of XII., represent work to which he has devoted the

closest care. A threatened constitutional crisis has, however, constrained him to write the rest of the volume at greater speed than, in the interests of Social Science and literary form, he would otherwise have done.

When he reaches the latter half of the volume, the reader will perceive the writer's dilemma. Two duties were incumbent upon him. In the first place he had to submit to the public a Neo-Catholic alternative to political Socialism, on lines which would make a Neo-Catholic Corporation the Landlord of the casual labourer, and a Shareholder in Industry. In the second place, he had, by every available device, to beat and batter down the view accepted by the British Public, since the Reformation, that the House of Commons is the Institution we require for Social service.

In chapters X. and XI. his constructive Neo-Catholic proposals have, therefore, been intermingled with attempts to discountenance the view that Politicians (who represent the Nation as organized for self-interest) are really Social Reformers at all. And, inasmuch as Liberal Politicians were, at the time when he was writing, giving the Nation a happy illustration of this fact, in a series of singularly unsocial speeches, and unscientific proposals, he may in haste have done this on lines which might make it appear, from the following pages, that the writer believes Liberal Unionist and Unionist Politicians are Social Reformers.

The writer, therefore, takes this opportunity of saying emphatically, that, in his humble opinion, it is six of one to half-a-dozen of the other : and that the genuine Social Reformers we want, must be a new Order of fully-trained Social Wardens, who will make the Home the basis of Social Reform, on lines indicated in chapter IX., and a Neo-Catholic Corporation a Shareholder in Industry, as in chapters VII. and VIII.

And now, a second difficulty presented itself to the writer. For he perceived that the transference from a party and political conception of Society into a scientific State and Church regime, would have to be effected slowly. And, inasmuch as the Nation had, for such a vast time, looked to Political chiefs for leadership, the upward movement towards a new conception of Society would have to be, to some extent, effected by one of the great Political Parties in the State, with just a dash of those party polemics which guarantee effective criticism of all new programmes.

Until the day of his death a Tory—Lord Beaconsfield—had, in both his letters and speeches, been steadily paving the way for a return to a State and Church regime in accordance with which the Church (her new endowments controlled by Laymen of all denominations), would have become, as she was for fifteen centuries, down to the Reformation, a Collective Institution, but in a modernized scientific manner. For, as Lord Beaconsfield picturesquely



expressed it; he was convinced that "when the deluge was over the ark would be found floating on the top of the water;" and what was required to effect that end was "the control by Laymen of Church matters which are not of a spiritual character."

The fact that a Liberal Epoch—during which we had (since the destruction, at the Reformation, of corporate Church property covering one-third of the land), been freeing ourselves from the spiritual intolerance of priest - controlled Catholicism—is to-day wound up; and the further fact that progress must now be achieved by endowing the Church, made it therefore, natural for the writer to look to the Tory Party (which had, since the Reformation, defended such collective corporate property as remained from the onslaughts of Liberal Individualists), as the Party obviously designed to teach the Nation to-day, that it is to the Church and self-sacrifice rather than to the House of Commons, and political self-interest, that they must look for practical Social Reform.

When, however, he turned to the history of political parties since the death of Lord Beaconsfield, the writer perceived the amazing fact that the policy of the Tory Party had, since the Home Rule Bill, been directed, in the main, by a Liberal Unionist, a Unitarian and an individualist—Mr. Joseph Chamberlain—who, though he had, with Liberals, favoured the creation of corporate National property, in the



form of our National Schools, had accepted the idea that the House of Commons was the place for Social Reform. On the other hand, Liberals had, since Lord Beaconsfield's death, thrown over their old Individualism, and accepted the Collective principle, but looked, of all things in the world, to an Individualistic Institution, the House of Commons, as the best Institution to embody twentieth century Collectivism, and to appeals to class hatred, rather than self-sacrifice, to effect moral reform.

In other words, the writer perceived that both Political Parties had, since 1886, exchanged principles, and were standing, intellectually speaking, upon their heads, in the most impossible attitudes.

On the one hand, the Liberals had rejected their old Individualistic garment and joined hands with the corporate Socialists, but failed to perceive that the one corporate Collective Institution in the State was our old National Church. On the other hand, under the leadership of Mr. Chamberlain, the Tory Party had deserted Lord Beaconsfield's ideal of the Church being broadened out into a great corporate Institution for social service, and had put on, if one might so express it, the "plutocratic pants," of Individualistic Liberal-Unionism, and Whiggism. For, far from being the Party of the Church, the Tory Party had become, under Mr. Chamberlain's guidance, an individualistic plutocratic Party.

What was the writer to do? After prolonged

reflection, he came to the conclusion that what was most essential to social peace was for the Nation to have a good laugh over the situation, and for the Tory Party, the more responsible Party, to become once more, as it had been under Lord Beaconsfield, a collective Party, pledged to the ideal of voluntarily endowing the Church for social service, but conceding to post-Reformation Liberalism the ideal that new Church endowments for social ends should be controlled by the Laity, and by a new Order of scientifically trained Social Wardens. For by this means both parties would be able to unite for social service.

In so doing, it seemed impossible for the writer to avoid a momentary collision with existing so-called Toryism in the person of Mr. Balfour, since Mr. Chamberlain was ill: a collision which was all the more distasteful on account of Mr. Balfour's invariable courtesy, on all occasions, to both his friends and his foes. The simplest plan, nevertheless, seemed to be to submit, in all good humour, that Mr. Balfour was wearing quasi-Liberal clothes, and should exchange them for those of a Neo-Catholic hue.

To this end it is necessary for the writer to state in this introductory preface, that he does not believe that Mr. Balfour's Liberal Unionist speech at Bingley Hall, in which he represented the Tory Party as an individualistic and purely commercial Party, represented the real views of the Church-

men and gentlemen of Britain as a whole. On the contrary, the writer holds, with Lord Beaconsfield, that the true policy of the Tory party, of the Churchmen and the gentlemen of Britain, which Mr. Balfour should have developed at Bingley Hall, was that it is the duty of the strong to help the weak: *i.e.*, that it is the duty of wealthy men to be the practical leaders of the people, and, of their own free will, to endow the Church for social service.

Confident that Liberals, on reflection, would agree that their Collective ideals must obviously be embodied in a corporate Collective Institution (such as the House of Commons is not, and never could be), the writer has elected, throughout the following pages, to go boldly on the assumption that Tories in the country, (if not in the House of Commons or London newspapers), are composed of men who care for the Church more than for the House of Commons, and for the honour of their country more than for their own individualistic fortunes. For, when tens of thousands of the Nation are badly housed, and women are sweated, the only honourable course for the gentlemen of England to pursue is, obviously to gallop to the rescue of these people, without any Budgets or House of Commons to goad them into social activity.

It was because those in control of Unionist and Liberal Unionist political machinery did not seem to see this, and accepted Parliament as the place for

social ills to be solved, that, at the very outset of these pages, the writer has to call back the Tory Party to those principles of *noblesse oblige* and honour which were upheld by Lord Beaconsfield, Lord Shaftesbury, and Lord John Manners, and which were expressed by the first of these, when he said :—

“ The proper leaders of the people are the gentlemen of England. If they are not the leaders of the people, I do not see why there should be gentlemen. Yes, it is because the gentlemen of England have been negligent of their duties, and unmindful of their station, that the system of professional agitation, so ruinous to the best interests of the country, has arisen in England.”

And now, having collided with Mr. Balfour, it is necessary for the writer to say, that he feels he has done a somewhat shabby thing, and that he hopes Mr. Balfour and Mr. Chamberlain will forgive him. For he is confident that neither of them consciously desired the Tory party to follow, what have of late, been honour-lacking ideals, and that it has been merely their unflagging devotion to the Lower House, rather than the Church, which has prevented them from developing the legacy of their illustrious predecessor, and from perceiving those fatal flaws in the partisan character of the Lower House (and in its exclusive reliance upon taxation), which make it the worst institution an unbiassed mind can conceive, for effecting that detailed social

reform, which the disappearance of corporate Church property (covering one-third of Britain) at the Reformation has, alas! rendered so necessary.

In his well-known essay on Sir Robert Peel, the late Walter Bagehot has most truly observed that the immensely heavy routine of modern office makes a British statesman, through no fault of his own, usually incapable of original thought, or of gripping the needs of a new age, inasmuch as that routine is not merely routine, but "a distracting routine." No one acquainted with the immense work of political life can deny that what was true when Bagehot elaborated that view, so long ago as 1857, is five times truer to-day. Anyone, therefore, with the remotest grasp of the cruelly immense tasks which we impose upon our public men, quite apart altogether from constant attendance at the House of Commons to the most unearthly hours in the morning, must agree that, far from blaming Mr. Balfour for his inability to grasp the needs of a new Epoch, we shall agree rather to be grateful that Mr. Balfour ever had the public spirit to enter public life at all.

But more than this. For, by one of those curious mishaps—which the ancients would have attributed to the stars—it has been Mr. Balfour's misfortune that, with the late Lord Salisbury, he has been a student of physical rather than social Science.

Those who would hastily blame him, should, therefore, perhaps remember that in studying



physical rather than social Science, Mr. Balfour has been singularly unlucky, and deserves our sympathy rather than our sneers. For if there ever was a need for a Tory statesman to have bold faith in the essential goodness of human nature, bold faith in man's voluntary benevolence, bold faith in the Church as the Social Engine of the future, that need was never so urgent as during the last quarter-of-a-century. And if ever there was a particular pursuit, which a Tory statesman called upon to lead a disheartened generation, would be lucky if Fate had not destined him to follow it, it would be that same study of physical Science which, during the last half-century, has done so much to insist that of the factors which have entered into the production of such a composite being as Man, the most important was the original contribution made, at some primeval period, by a quarrelsome anthropomorphic Ape.

If fortune had been kinder, and Mr. Balfour had studied Lord Beaconsfield's speeches and letters and the organic elements of collective Toryism, he would have discovered therein all the elements for a social Science of man's social, as opposed to his purely physical, evolution, a social Science whose conclusions would be at least as solid as, and certainly as cheery and aspiring as, the conclusions to be found in the *Origin of Speeches*.

And now, turning from Mr. Balfour to his opponents, it should be pointed out, that having developed

Lord Beaconsfield's legacy as to the social duties of the Tory Party, and given what, to many of this generation, may be a somewhat new connotation to the term "Tory," the writer has, in the following pages, rounded on Mr. Lloyd George and his friends, and accused them of want of faith in the "old Tory" principle of voluntary benevolence, and of setting most unscientific precedents to posterity. For this also was necessary to secure a triumph for Neo-Catholic methods of Social Reform.

In other words, it was necessary for politicians of all parties to be thoroughly discountenanced, and for the device of promoting our social welfare through the House of Commons, to be shewn up for the unlucky humbug that it is, in order to pave the way for a nobler National Institution for social service, than is the House of Commons: an Institution which shall represent the Nation as organized for Love and kindness rather than for self-interest.

If, therefore, Mr. Lloyd George and his friends, finding their policy of promoting self-sacrifice by means of "bung" placards ridiculed in these pages, turn round and say that they will believe in Tory generosity, when they see a little more of it,\* they will be pursuing a course which no one will

---

\* At the same time, as is shewn on p. 173, the nucleus of a system for dealing with unearned increment on voluntary lines, is already in existence, and brings in seven or eight times more than Mr. Lloyd George's proposals.



welcome more than the writer, who submits that it is by quickening the honour of the abnormally wealthy rather than taxing them, by spiteful party-force (which invariably creates opposition) that the gifts of land, houses, and shares for the social endowment of the Church and the solution of our social ills are to be secured.

These tedious explanations are, unfortunately, necessary. For, without them, the vast number of Liberals in the country who have been taught by old Liberal Individualists to oppose Tory Collectivism, in the form of Church endowments, might have assumed that, in championing old Tory principles of statesmanship, the writer is, in certain of those pages which follow, defending the present Plutocracy. The writer is doing no such thing. He rather uses the word "old Tory" as John Ruskin (whom most Liberals have learned to respect) and Lord Beaconsfield used it. For both of these Collectivists described themselves as "old Tories," and were accurate in so doing. For that Church which the Tories exist to defend is the only corporate collective Institution in the country and, as we shall shortly see, it is to the scientific revitalized functions of voluntary Church endowments, rather than to Taxation, that all Western Europe must turn to avert an otherwise inevitable Social Revolution.

If, therefore, Liberals and Socialists who desire to nationalize a portion of our land and capital, but propose to quicken the path of progress by destroy-

ing rather than increasing such Church endowments as remain, find themselves held up to ridicule in the following pages, they will perhaps cordially note that, in associating his programme with the Tory rather than the Liberal Party, the writer was, under the amazing circumstances which have arisen since 1886, quickening rather than delaying that Collective Movement which they themselves advocate; inasmuch as the Tory Party of to-day requires to be reminded that the Tory Party is nothing if not a Collective Party. Historically speaking, that is to say, the Tory Party was, from the time of William the Conqueror down to the death of Lord Beaconsfield, in 1881, a Collective Party.

Since 1886, when the Liberal Unionists and Whigs joined it, the Tory Party has lost its old characteristics entirely. Liberal Unionist and Whig ideas have come to control the party entirely. It has ceased to be a collective Church party whose main planks are unpaid social service, chivalry, and the old Tory mediæval gospel of the Mother and the Child which the original 17th Century Tories upheld. It has degenerated into a party of business men "on the make," and it is to recall it to first principles that this volume has been written. For on a higher plane of social evolution old Tory principles—the worship of the Mother and the Child, chivalry and *noblesse oblige*, the duties rather than the rights of both Capital and Labour, and the principle that a larger proportion of land, capital, etc.,

should be, as in old Tory times, the property of the Church, but be controlled by the Laity (on scientific rather than theological lines) and used for social ends—all these old organic Tory principles, I say, offer the only statesmanlike solution to those social problems which are the problems of the century. For individualistic Liberalism has achieved its ends, and so has the House of Commons, that destructive institution which came into such abnormal prominence to promote individual liberty.

If, however, under recent leadership, the Unionist Party has been transformed from a collective Church Party into a Liberal Unionist business association of a Liberal type, the position of the present Liberal Party is equally ludicrous. They have thrown away those old individualistic clothes, which they had worn since the Reformation, and have accepted the corporate collective principle. But, while they are a Party with principles, they are a Party without clothes. And, until they have thrown over-board (from the point of view of Social Reform) that Individualistic Institution, the House of Commons, and that fantastic chimera, a non-disciplinary mandate-controlled, socialistic "State," and put upon themselves the armour of light, by embodying their collective principles in a corporate disciplinary Neo-Catholic Church, the less they appear on public platforms, the better for public decency, and social peace.

These are hard sayings, but until it is understood, from Land's End to John of Groat's, that both parties have run off the rails and become, at the end of an Epoch, commercial cliques, there is no chance of our being able to establish a statesmanlike Neo-Catholic Institution for social service, which will rely for its driving-force on Love, and for its funds on generosity, honour, chivalry, and on a bold attempt to create a new environment for Mother and Child. And that it is a truth which will, the writer is confident, be recognised by none more gladly than by existing Politicians themselves.

In conclusion, the writer would once more beg the reader to remember that the somewhat tart observations on Liberal Politicians in the latter half of this volume were written with greater speed than, but for the so-called constitutional crisis, he would have done; and that he has no desire to exalt the Unionist Party at the expense of their opponents. His supreme desire is to secure social peace; and, from that point of view, the more carefully written summary of his proposals at the beginning of the volume, will give the reader a clearer idea of the genial non-party atmosphere which will, he is confident, pervade the Neo-Catholic Civilization of the future, than is to be found in his alas! needful attempts in Chapter XI. to "smash up" the view that Politicians are really statesmanlike Social Reformers. With greater time at his disposal he would have attempted to do this in a more gracious fashion;



and he earnestly hopes that any "personalities" in which he may have indulged, will be read by all concerned with the same good humour in which they were written.

Lastly, it should be remembered that if the Neo-Catholic conception of Society advocated in these pages should be accepted by reponsible citizens as the social policy of the future, the triumph will be a triumph for the Church, her Founder, and the Mothers and children of Britain, rather than for the writer, whose aim is to be but the humble temporary exponent of a mere section of the Church's new policy in reference to economic and social matters. If any credit is due in this respect to aught save the Church, her Founder, and the children, the credit is due to the Church's practical social workers (from St. James and St. Francis down to such an one as the present Bishop of London or the Rev. J. H. Jowett, of Birmingham); to the numerous social writers whose works the writer has consulted; to the history school at Oxford, where he studied the slow and temperate development of our historic Constitution, and to that "Public School" whose inspiring environment taught him, from the moment he entered her walls, to understand that the true goal of every "Public School" boy should be to be the servant of the public.

E. E. M.

## CONTENTS.

---

### INTRODUCTION.—LORD BEACONSFIELD AND AND HIS SUCCESSORS : OR

Author's apologies to so-called Liberalism and to  
Balfourian Liberalism                      ...      pp. v.—xx.

### PART I.

“Stern Daughter of the Voice of God  
O Duty! if that name thou love.”

### CHAPTER I.

#### ELIZABETHAN AND PRESENT DAY BRITAIN : OR DISCIPLINE AND LIBERTY.

The Mediæval Church a democratic institution on the side of the poor—Our great Elizabethan Epoch displayed the results of Catholic Collectivism, and Protestant Individualism happily blended—The contrast to-day—The Remedy. Discipline and a truer conception of liberty, or the development of a scientific property-owning Catholicism to modify existing Individualism.                      ...      pp. 1—16

### CHAPTER II.

#### THE RETURN OF THE CHURCH : OR, TOWARDS A NOBLER NATIONAL INSTITUTION THAN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

Thoughtful persons have long been losing faith in the ability of the House of Commons to direct everything—Lord Beaconsfield predicts that the labours of our ancestors will have been in vain if the divine Right of Kings is to be succeeded by the divine Right of the House of Commons :



for it will result in our destinies being guided by "a vulgar and ignoble oligarchy."—We must not, however, be unduly hard on politicians for the fact that we have come to the end of a great Epoch. Mazzini, Emerson, Burke, Walter Bagehot, give testimony of the need for new Institutions at given Epochs—"A statesman who will hereafter know what our real opinion is, will have to listen, not to a loud voice, but to a still, small voice . . . to the opinion which is treasured in secret, rather than that which is noised abroad."—Macaulay points out, that an incessant Parliamentary debater becomes, through no fault of his own, incapable of the original thought necessary to deal with changing economic conditions—Lord Rosebery on constitutional development in Japan—Summary of the case for Constitutional advance. . . . pp. 17—40

### CHAPTER III.

#### PROTESTANT INDIVIDUALISM : OR, THE CONSTITUTIONAL ORIGIN OF THE SOCIAL PROBLEM.

How modern commerce entered the British Constitution—The Plutocrat or Democrat, rather than the Statesman, to-day the Master of Britain—To govern socially a Statesman must have command over vast Crown Lands, and Crown Shares in Industry—or else vast Church Lands and Church Shares in Industry—The House of Commons can only acquire these by a Social Revolution—The Church must therefore acquire them by a gentle Religious Reformation, which will rehabilitate Corporate Property—How Modern Commerce entered the German Constitution—Bismarck and Crown-Property : "While I was in power the party to which I belonged consisted of the King and myself"—German Bureaucracy will probably break down as the Crown in Germany becomes weak—A British

Bismarck would develop the Church rather than the State, and thus throw down the gauntlet to both Plutocracy and Democracy, as Bismarck did—How Modern Commerce entered the American Constitution—America anticipates Neo-Catholicism, and her Child Courts and Leagues of Consumers represent the dawn of Neo-Catholicism across the Atlantic—Summary of the Constitutional Origin of the Social Problem, which is due to the temporary break-up of the old Catholic Organization, during an Epoch of transition, 1550-1910, because that Catholic Organization was controlled in the superstitious South, at Rome. ... pp. 41—74

#### CHAPTER IV.

##### CATHOLIC COLLECTIVISM : OR, THE CONSTITUTIONAL CURE OF THE SOCIAL PROBLEM.

If the Conservative Party were to call the Radical Grocer "Belly," as the Liberals call the Brewer "Bung," and attack him for his shoddy food—Ribbald and Rabelaisian methods of Social Reform played out—Gentle Neo-Catholic Alternative—Fundamental difference between disciplinary Neo-Catholic Collectivism and Political Socialism—No leisure-creating machinery in Middle Ages except the disciplinary Collective Monastery—Neo-Catholic Corporation must acquire, by bequests, interest in machinery of Modern life, and create a juster environment and leisure for those now over-worked or under-paid—but on disciplinary lines—Neo-Catholic Corporation must discipline both Democracy and Plutocracy—It must be controlled mainly by new Social Wardens, partly by Clergy and Ministers, partly by Representatives of Social Workers, and of those who endow the Church. ... pp. 75—94

## CHAPTER V.

THE "DARK AGES" OF MACHINERY : OR,  
1760—1910.

Secret History of Britain, since 1760. The Coming of Wealth-creating Machinery under Anti-Catholic Auspices has had a temporarily demoralizing effect. What happened at the Industrial Revolution of 1760. We are transformed from an Agricultural into an Urban people, but still possess Agricultural customs — Vast development of Modern Commerce under anti-Catholic auspices. Our misfortune that the discipline and endowments of the Church did not return in a scientific form in 1760, when machinery entered our Individualistic Constitution—Burke got very near this truth when, in 1769, he made the Catholic Declaration that wealth must be "the laborious slave of public virtue and of public honour." pp. 95—110

## CHAPTER VI.

WEALTH AND THE COMMONWEALTH : OR,  
INDIVIDUALISM AND COLLECTIVISM.  
(A Neo-Catholic Via-Media).

Extremes are to be avoided by a practical people—The case for Collectivism—Progress inherent in Capital rather than in Labour—How modern fortunes are due to co-operation of Capitalists with Humanity and Co. Social machinery such as Post Office, Printing Press, Banks, and all forms of social machinery are utilized by the wealthy without, often, giving Humanity and Co. their partner, a fair share of profits—The case for Individualism—Individual Leadership vital to commercial success—Excessive Collectivism fatal to scientific progress—If we

had nationalized the canals—Nationalize the railways in 1911 and, by 1921, you will find that, owing to the development of new motor roads, Aeroplanes, and Monoplanes, you have made a bad bargain in purchasing the Railways for the community, and have paid for them more than they were worth—The conclusion is that you must make a Neo-Catholic Corporation the Landlord of the Casual Labourer, and a Shareholder, but not a Manager, in Industry.      ...      ...      ...      pp. 111—126

## PART II.

“He that believeth shall not make haste.”

### CHAPTER VII.

#### THE CHURCH AS SHAREHOLDER : OR, MORALIZING TRADE.

Functions of Neo-Catholic Corporation as Shareholder of less immediate importance than her task as Landlord—Moralizing the introduction of Protection—Difference between Protection under a Kingly Bismarckian Executive, and Protection in a party-controlled land—Social and moral advantages of Protection that it limits competition—John Bright confesses that, as other countries have not accepted Free Trade, something must be done—Silk Industry consumed by the rich. No one hurt if it costs slightly more and gives variety of employment—Other Nations use Tariffs to create industries for which they are not as well adapted by Nature as ourselves, so must we, but it is a question of degree and demands cool scientific statesmanship rather than going the whole hog—Evils of Protection in the form of Monopolies—Protection—

ist "fortunes" must be voluntarily bequeathed for social ends to a Neo-Catholic Corporation—whose motto will be "I never trust a gentleman by halves"—A little child shall lead them—Moralizing Finance—The Banks must be encouraged to establish Agricultural Departments—Their present methods are Cobdenite in character—Onus for bringing to book firms who "sweat" must be, to a larger degree than at present, thrown on the shoulders of the Banks who finance such firms with their depositors' money, and then expect their depositors to pay the piper, in the form of increased rates for Social Reform, which would not be necessary if the Banks, assisted by Protection, stopped "sweating," as they unquestionably can—Stupidity of attacking the Banks—As Lord Salisbury said "days of violent surgery are dead"—Methods such as those whereby Lord Shaftesbury, himself a Conservative, secured the passing of the Factory Acts—must be adopted. pp. 129—155

## CHAPTER VIII.

### MORALIZING LEGACIES : OR, THE CHURCH AS SHAREHOLDER (concluded).

Change in character of Property since 1760—No change in customs regarding it — Share-property absolutely irresponsible—We have an Agricultural Constitution but most wealth is Town wealth—We must return to the Mediæval system of endowing the Church for social service, as Disraeli foresaw—When William the Conqueror carved out the land he made the endowing of the Church by the wealthy an element in his State and Church policy—Mr. Lloyd George and the Budget—Ignorant of Constitutional origin of the Social Problem, Mr. Lloyd George displays



no faith in scientific benevolence though the nucleus for dealing with unearned increment on moral, voluntary, lines is already in existence, and brings in more than Mr. Lloyd George's proposals—Duke William of Normandy had greater faith in human nature a thousand years ago than Mr. Lloyd George and Mr. Churchill have to-day—Mr. Runciman's ampitheatre "turn"—No attack on Mr. Lloyd George, merely alternative proposed whereby House of Lords assist to establish a Neo-Catholic Corporation to which unearned increment of all kinds (including Protectionist unearned increment) can be voluntarily bequeathed as a result of appeals to honour made by the Ladies—This new Tory Cavalier policy of honour gives Liberals a moral victory and takes the sting out of Tariff Reform—Peace with honour—Summary of the case for a Neo-Catholic Corporation becoming a Shareholder in industry—Answer to the "sharp" business man. ... pp. 156—200

## CHAPTER IX.

### THE CHURCH AS LANDLORD : OR, THE HOME THE BASIS OF SOCIAL REFORM.

Of the whole Social Problem by far the most important is the providing of proper homes, at righteous rents, for those classes who are without inherited capital—Artificial nature of modern commerce, and the strained conditions of modern life, makes the guarantee of proper homes vital to industrial efficiency as well as moral health—The Housing Problem is not to be solved by Taxation, by Loan-raising, by the Municipality, or by "the State"—It must be solved boldly by scientific benevolence, by the co-ordination of the millions (probably £30,000,000 per



annum) now wasted on over-lapping charities, and by all classes voluntarily endowing a disciplinary Neo-Catholic Corporation with gifts of land, houses and capital, in order that it may become the Landlord of the casual labourer. Immense superiority of this Tory-Cavalier scheme over all others—A cheap Church Home must only be let on detailed disciplinary conditions, such as that a man feeds his children, and puts by small sums, (to be added to by the Church), against seasons of unemployment, such sums to be collected weekly with his rent—If a workman, in receipt of a decent wage, fails to feed his children, the Church, acting on behalf of his wife and the community, will be legally empowered to intercept his wages, at payday, and feed his children with the proceeds—Cheap Church lodgings furnished for casual labourers working away from home, conditional to their forwarding two-thirds of their wages, through the Church, to their families—A home-owning Corporation will, in due course of time, be able to tackle every aspect of the Social Problem—It will place contracts during seasons when trade is bad—It will offer, on certain stipulations, a home, rent-free, to a widow and her children—It will, in conjunction with the Banks and Protection, prevent “home women-workers” from being “sweated”—The home will be held by the Church on behalf of the wife, and will secure a new respect for a woman who marries, from her husband and for daughters from their father—The generosity needful to endow such a disciplinary Church to be quickened, not by Politicians, but by the Mothers of Britain, acting under the leadership (should her Majesty graciously consent) of the Queen—Precedent for this course of action set by Queen Elizabeth—Consequent need for peace. ... pp. 201—234

## CHAPTER X.

THE CHURCH IN ACTION ; OR,  
THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A NEO-CATHOLIC CORPORATION.

Qualification for a Neo-Catholic vote—New University Settlements—The Problem of Holy Orders—Non-conformity and the need for all Social Reformers to retire upon a new tested base, the home—True Social Reformers must love the rich as well as the poor—Folly of financial centralization at Westminster—Rough Estimate of Cost—By advocating Socialism Liberals virtually accept Tory Neo-Catholicism, though without the discipline of Catholic Collectivism, without which their Socialism breaks down utterly—Consequent need for peace. ... pp. 235—272.

## CHAPTER XI.

## STATE AND CHURCH : OR, EXIT THE ROUNDHEADS.

International peace attainable only through an International Church—The Founder of Christianity accepts the State, and the principle of leadership by the fittest—Consequent agreement between Christianity and Science—Why the Church and State principle, after succeeding for fifteen centuries, broke down—Chalmers and Lord Beaconsfield anticipate its inevitable return, and the latter, declares that, when the deluge is over, the ark will be found floating on the top of the water—Mr. Gladstone, on the other hand, listens to a loud voice, expects the House of Commons to do the work of an International Church, and starts the Athenian cry of the masses against the classes, which can only lead to a Social Revolution—Mr. Asquith and his friends fall into the Gladstonian trap : their attempt to promote international reduction of armaments through the State rather than the Churches,

fails—Mr. Asquith sets unscientific precedents to what may be the Labour Ministry of the future—In asserting that the House of Commons is supreme in financial matters Mr. Asquith relies on precedents set in centuries when the franchise was not extended to the working classes, and when there was no Labour Party—He claims that the House of Commons represents the people—it does not—it represents the discontent of the people rather than the wisdom which can uplift and inspire the people—that wisdom is to be found, not in taxation, but in the new scientific activity of an ancient Church, the one non-party Institution we have left in common to all classes—Mr. Churchill the Nebuchadnezzar of Democracy virtually sets up a statue to State Force, “Winston Churchill live for ever”—Mr. Churchill’s grandson represented as summing up the situation “Grandfather was in a hurry was’nt he? He wanted to goad our ancestors into generosity.”—Author’s apologies to so-called Liberalism. ... pp. 273—323

## CHAPTER XII.

### STATE AND CHURCH : OR, STABILITY AND ADVANCE.

The State must attend efficiently to National Defence, Industry, Agricultural, and Imperial Federation, leaving Social Reform to a Neo-Catholic Corporation, which shall organize benevolence, and make it scientific—The State stands for needful self-assertion, a Neo-Catholic Corporation for equally needful self-repression and self-sacrifice—Danger of confounding cowardice with altruism—It is not the duty of the Fleet, in case of war, to defend these Isles, but to go for the enemy’s Fleet, wherever it may be—If this policy is not pursued, an enemy with a powerful

Fleet, if it gave our Fleet the slip, could mass the whole of its strength in the Atlantic, and cut off our corn supply—Universal National Training the only self-respecting policy—The need for Imperial Federation between Britain and the Dominions—The true Imperialism a Village Imperialism—The case for an Imperial Ferry, which, by reducing freightage, will give the Dominions and Great Britain a preference without a tax on corn—Imperial Federation not a party question—Agriculture and the future—Neo-Catholic Corporation to become a Landowner, by purchasing agricultural estates—Summary of the weakness of a transitional epoch 1550-1910—We have been trying, since the Reformation, to play National Chess without the Bishops and the Queen—Revival, under a scientific form of Social discipline, and of the mediæval Ideal of the Mother and her Child, who can ask for self-sacrifice in a way that party politicians cannot—Our ignorance of the social achievements of the Mediæval Church the only reason why we did not, long since, establish a Neo-Catholic Corporation, of a scientific character, for social service—Daring social and economic achievements of the Church from 1 A.D. to 1500—Let us have bold faith in voluntary benevolence—Our first Neo-Catholic task must be the education of a new Order of business-like Social Wardens of a Neo-Franciscan type—In quietness and confidence shall be your strength—Man's spiritual origin and destiny—Working for the children our main ideal—Consequent need for entering the New Epoch in a calm, collected and scientific frame of mind.     ...     ...     ... pp. 324—379





---

PART I.

---

*Stern Daughter of the Voice of God !  
O Duty ! if that name thou love  
Who art a light to guide, a rod  
To check the erring, and reprove ;  
Thou who art victory and law  
When empty terrors overawe ;  
From vain temptations dost set free,  
And calm'st the weary strife of frail humanity !*

*I, loving freedom, and untried,  
No sport of every random gust,  
Yet being to myself a guide,  
Too blindly have reposed my trust :  
And oft, when in my heart was heard  
Thy timely mandate, I deferr'd  
The task, in smoother walks to stray ;  
But thee I now would serve more strictly, if I may.*

—WORDSWORTH'S "Ode to Duty."

# CHURCH AND NATION.

## PART I.

---

### CHAPTER I.

#### ELIZABETHAN AND PRESENT-DAY ENGLAND :

OR

#### DISCIPLINE AND LIBERTY

“Whoso looketh into the perfect law of liberty, and continueth therein, he being not a forgetful hearer, but a doer of the work, this man shall be blessed in his deed.”—*St. James*.

DURING the last three-hundred years, in England, we have had many kinds of so-called practical or applied Christianity. Before the Reformation there was really only one. That is to say a single Church which had gradually acquired—mainly by voluntary endowments—a third of the land in this country, stood in the place of our now so-called “Christian” parties, and did what they and our “Political” parties have always been going to do, but have never yet really done; *i.e.* looked after the poor and destitute, the women and children, and provided, or

had the money to provide if they chose,\* beautiful old Alms-Houses rather than tawdry Post-Office pensions for the old-age of the deserving poor.

It was well to have Monasticism destroyed, but it is becoming increasingly clear that our Reformers made the mistake, which the Laws of Political Science tell us must no longer be made, of legislating in haste, in passion, and in the spirit of party, instead of in a calm, a scientific, and a National frame of mind. For the result of their hasty destruction of Church property was that, after the Reformation, dozens of sects arose, and Christians have, ever since, been so busy quarrelling among themselves that they have had neither the energy or the time left really to look after the financially weak or destitute. They have left the task to politicians, and the politicians have been so busy quarrelling among themselves, very largely, be it said, on religion also, that, though they have always been going to do something, they have never yet really done it. Hence the state of our slums to-day.

Three men have attempted, since the Reformation and the destruction of Church property,

---

\* They could not do so fully because of the comparative barbarity of the age and because much of their rents went, as "Peter's Pence," to Rome. The point submitted is that the pre-Reformation system of raising money for social ends by voluntary bequests, at death, to the Church, was a better system of raising money for social ends than is our present system of increasing house or income taxes during life.

to create once more a constructive "Church and King" Party which should attend to Social Welfare through the Church and National Defence through the State ; and, being animated by a desire to do full justice to all classes, secure a period of rest and tranquillity, during which it would be possible to reform with that calm and freedom from prejudice which the interests of the community, as a whole, demand. The names of these three men are Strafford, Bolingbroke, and Beaconsfield.

It is easy for the historical pedant to bring documentary evidence to prove that Strafford, Bolingbroke, and Beaconsfield were not wholly animated by this principle. Men of strong personality, who desire to secure such power as shall enable them to legislate for the Community as a whole, are always liable to have their sincerity questioned. For they have always been compelled to make use of Party Machinery of some sort, and, having associated themselves with the Machinery of an historic party, they have often been regarded by their countrymen as Class rather than National Leaders ; and this view of their careers has been promulgated by their foes and become familiar to the Public. Nevertheless, a careful study of the lives of Strafford, Bolingbroke, and Beaconsfield should convince the most prejudiced that the real aim of the three Statesmen in question, has been a Church and State policy, which should partly take the place in British History of practical Kingship and of that



historic Church, which, because before the Reformation it held one-third of the land, and because, in spite of many short-comings due to the ignorance of the age, it strove to do justice to the claims of all classes, succeeded in making the men of old England feel a sense of solidarity, of common brotherhood, and of common nationality which found its climax in the age of Queen Elizabeth.

#### ELIZABETHAN ENGLAND.

For in the days of Queen Elizabeth England was first really a Nation, and Englishmen of all classes were really brothers. Animated from Land's End to John of Groat's, by this sense of practical and not sentimental brotherhood, England showed a spirit of enterprise abroad and hope at home, which has made the Elizabethan Epoch unparalleled in the history of the world. The Monasteries—those first homes of agriculture, of our almost vanished handicrafts, and of our first attempts to “humanise” Democracy—had, it is true, recently been destroyed and there were, in consequence, a number of unemployed workmen, or “sturdy vagabonds” as they were called, wandering about the country. But scarcely anyone was so foolish in those days as to call everyone who worked with head instead of hands, “a grinder of the poor,” with the obvious result that a clearer understanding existed between various classes than to-day.

Since, moreover, nine-tenths of our population then lived on the land—rich and poor side by side,

with a National Church in their midst, uniting them—that spirit of bitterness which arises when men earning different incomes live in different quarters of a too densely populated town, was comparatively unknown. Men did not go about the lanes of Elizabethan England whistling to themselves such doleful ditties as

“Your best, best friend  
Is your pocket in the end,”

or

“‘I should like to die,’ said Willie,  
‘If my father could die too.’” (a)

On the contrary, everyone was as happy as a May-fly. Shakespeare, who was the Adelphi Dramatist of his day, did not encourage the silly idea that the upper classes of this country consist of people who are merely idle, vicious, and “smart”; or that everyone earning more than five pounds a week is a heartless oppressor of the poor. On the contrary, the working classes of those days felt as they ought surely to be able to feel to-day, that an ancient nobility were, so to speak, their wealthier, bigger, and more powerful brothers and sisters, not their equals, but their natural Leaders. On the other hand, there were no class newspapers in those days to foster in the minds of the middle classes, the upper classes, and the less intelligent of the nobility, as class newspapers too often do to-day, the equally ridiculous notion that everyone who cannot find

---

(a) Sankey and Moody. (“Sacred Songs and Solos,” No. 415.)

employment and seeks temporary assistance in those Work-houses and Shelters which have to-day taken the place of the kind old Monasteries and Alms-houses of the Church, is of necessity a "Wastrel" or a "Socialist." On the contrary, the spirit which animated the Nation, from top to toe, was mirrored by Shakespeare in lines which will endure so long as a sense of common Nationality is a factor in the uplifting and ennobling of mankind.

These, for instance, are the sentiments which Shakespeare puts into the mouth of Henry V. as a contemporary ideal of a typical National King, as he muses before the Battle of Agincourt,

"Rather proclaim it, Westmoreland, through my host,  
That he which hath no stomach to this fight,  
Let him depart ; his passport shall be made  
And crowns for convoys put into his purse ;  
We would not die in that man's company  
That fears his fellowship to die with us.  
He that shall live this day and see old age,  
Will yearly on the vigil feast his friends,  
And say, ' to-morrow is Saint Crispian ' :  
Then will he strip his sleeve and show his scars  
And say, ' These wounds had I on Crispian's day.'  
Old men forget : yea, all shall be forgot,  
But he'll remember, with advantages,  
What feats he did that day. Then shall our names  
Harry the King, Bedford and Exeter,  
Warwick and Talbot, Salisbury and Gloucester,—  
Be in their flowing cups freshly remembered :  
This story shall the good man teach his son ;

And Crispin Crispian shall ne'er go by,  
From this day to the ending of the world,  
But we in it shall be remembered :  
We few, we happy few, we band of brothers."

It need scarcely be said that this spirit, animating a whole people, made the achievements of sixteenth century Britain high and honourable. It was this National Epoch, when the best results of Mediæval discipline and Catholic "collectivism" blended with individual liberty—as they can only blend under Church, Kingly, and aspiring rather than Republican and levelling ideals of Government : it was this National Epoch, I say, which gave to British History not merely the blithe spirit of Protestant free thought, the stern ideals of Puritanism, our greatest Dramatists and our priceless Liturgy : it was this National Epoch, above all things, which gave us that virile translation of our Bible, which is to-day worshipped, almost fanatically, by those very persons who seem most opposed to the very spirit of Nationality which created it.

If such collective achievements as these sprang from and blended discipline and liberty, there never was an era when the enterprise and energy of individuals was more marked. Shakespeare, if we may describe such a myriad-minded being as an individual, wrote, as everyone knows, not merely of the Merchant of Venice, or the Prince of Denmark, but of the heroic past of England, Scotland, Wales, and Ireland. Marlowe, in his play of "Doctor Faustus,"

wrote lines, to Helen of Troy, which must ever remain the supreme language of the imaginative aspects of passion :—

“ Is this the face that launched a thousand ships ?  
And burnt the topless towers of Ilium ;  
Come Helen, make me immortal with a kiss !  
Ah ! thou art fairer than the evening air  
Clad in the beauty of a thousand stars ! ”

#### THE CONTRAST OF TO-DAY.

But why dilate upon facts such as these ?—some of which, at any rate, are known even to those liberty-madden little urchins who are turned out annually from our so-called National Schools, where they seem to learn everything but their duty to their country ! Who has not heard of Spencer, and Bacon, of Sir Francis Drake, and Sir Walter Raleigh, of Sir Philip Sidney, Cabot, Frobisher, and good Queen Bess ? Who, that cares for King and Country, does not cherish a passionate affection for that vain and flighty, but amazingly British, Queen—who united her people to such a degree, that when the great Armada came, Protestants and Catholics rose as one man, and gave the Spaniard such a thrashing, that he did not recover from it till the other day, when his Majesty King Alphonso persuaded pretty Princess Ena to share his southern throne, and risk her life on his royal motor.

And yet, though the facts are known to all, it is well, in these divided days, to recall the deeds of our



ancestors and the glory of the days gone by. How Macaulay, for all his Whig worship of everything but Nationality, kindles, as he tells the old tale:—Do our sleek burghers and comfort-clinging suburban dames, as they pass Whitehall, ever realise what that night meant?

“ The sentinel on Whitehall Gate, looked forth into the night,  
And saw o’erhanging Richmond Hill a streak of blood red light.  
Then bugle’s note and cannon’s roar, the death-like silence broke ;  
And, with one start, and with one cry, the royal city woke :  
At once on all her stately gates arose the answering fires ;  
At once the loud alarm clashed from all her reeling spires.  
From all the batteries of the Tower peeled loud the voice of fear,  
And all the thousand masts of Thames sent back a louder cheer.  
And from the farthest wards was heard the rush of hurrying feet,  
And the broad stream of flags and pikes dashed down each roaring street,  
And broader still became the blaze, and louder still the din,  
As fast from every village round the Horse came spurring in :  
And Eastward straight, from wild Blackheath, the war-like Errant went,  
And roused in many an ancient hall the gallant Squires of Kent ! ”



How the spirit of our race seems, at times, to have changed ! Let us imagine that this very night Mexico (we can say Mexico without arousing needless racial passion) had sent fifty troop-ships up the Thames, and was sacking London within a radius of three miles from Westminster Bridge. And let us suppose that someone, possessing a sixteenth-century mind and body, thinking that the honour of his country was more valuable than horse-flesh, were so far to forget the Anti-fox-hunting League, and the Pro-everybody-but-our-own-countrymen group, as to ride down into Kent with "loose rein and bloody spur," as they did in Armada days, what a strange greeting, in too many quarters, he would receive ! Do we not see him arrive, having ridden down three horses on the road, at some ancient Tudor Mansion, now inhabited by one of our up-to date Squires ? He rattles at the doors of the old Hall, where all that is noblest in the present should crown all that was noblest in the past. He rouses the owner, who is, at length, induced to descend, and asks him how many men he can bring up to London for the service of King and Country. But the owner of the Hall knows little, and cares less, about the cottagers around him. His only acquaintance with the "masses," as he calls them, has consisted in being the largest shareholder in a concern which employs five hundred girls, at five-shillings a week, in a jam factory, with whose profits he has purchased his present estate. He hands the rider a Tract, and a Plasmon

biscuit—the rider being in a frame of body when any normal man could eat about three raw steaks—and the rider hesitates as to whether he shall horse-whip the old humbug or leave him in scornful silence.

What would the rider do next? Would he go to the Police Station? Would he seek to find the residence of the local Tax-collector, the local Political Agent, or the most plausible Political Speaker? No! my countrymen: if the rider were wise, he would remember the one National Institution we have left, linking us to the glory of the days gone by. He would go to the old village Church, and there, with what strength he had, would sound an ancient bell, perchance the very bell which, on a grim Armada eve, told men of all creeds and classes that they must unite to save their land from pillage and their daughters from dishonour.

#### THE REMEDY :

##### DISCIPLINE AND A TRUER CONCEPTION OF LIBERTY.

It is of the revival of the disciplinary authority and collective activity of that ancient Church—though on modernized lines—that the present volume largely treats. As will shortly be shewn, the origin of most of the problems of our age is to be found in the disappearance of the disciplinary activity of the Church; and it is to a constructive Church rather than a destructive House of Commons that we must look for moral progress and social regeneration. For the Elizabethan age was great,

not merely because it saw the dawn of Protestant liberty, but also because, in it, the disciplinary influence of the mediæval Church had not faded, and an abnormal worship of Individualism had not resulted in evils which a great Elizabethan poet—Chapman—perceived would happen, in the following noble lines, wherein he predicted both the evil and the cure :—

“ Man is a torch borne in the wind : a dream  
But of a shadow, summ'd with all his substance ;  
And, as great seamen, using all their wealth  
And skills in Neptune's deep, invisible paths,  
In tall ships richly built and ribbed with brass,  
To put a girdle round about the world,  
When they have done it (coming near their haven)  
Are fain to give a warning piece, and call  
A poor stayed fisherman, that never past  
His country's sight, to waft and guide them in ;  
So, when we wander farthest through the waves  
Of glassy glory and the gulfs of state,  
Topp'd with all titles, spreading all our reaches  
*As if each private arm would sphere the earth,*  
We must to virtue for our guide resort,  
Or we shall shipwreck in our safest port.”

Writing a century later, when the movement towards individual liberty was in full tide, Hobbes, that staunch supporter of old Church principles, foreseeing the harmful results which an abuse of liberty would inevitably bring, wrote : “ It is an easy thing for men to be deceived by the specious

name of liberty; and for want of judgment to distinguish, mistake that for their private inheritance and birthright, which is the right of the public only. . . . The liberty, whereof there is so frequent and honourable mention in the histories and philosophies of the ancient Greeks and Romans, and in the writings and discourses of those that from them have received all their learning in the politics, is not the liberty of particular men; but the liberty of the commonwealth.”<sup>(a)</sup>

As Democracy is apt to forget, there is indeed a right and a wrong conception of liberty. We need to remember the wholesome warning of St. Paul, “Take heed lest by any means this liberty of yours become a stumbling-block to them that are weak.” Or again, “As free and not using your liberty for a cloak of maliciousness.” The right conception of liberty is surely one which recognises clearly the great responsibilities attaching to all who enjoy it. Then, and then only, it becomes the “Perfect Law of Liberty.” It is here that lies the weakness of Democracy. It is only to persons carefully disciplined to a fit sense of their duties that a Nation is justified in entrusting full rights and liberties. Advancing civilization has brought changed conditions of life, and with them new duties and new responsibilities. But, unfortunately, the sense of liberty has outstripped the sense of duty.

---

(a) Hobbes' *Leviathan*. C. XXI.

The exact nature of the new duties, the fittest instrument to discipline the Nation to a sense of them, and, at the same time, aid it in the most practical way to their fulfilment; the extent to which the new may be dove-tailed into the old, so as to secure progress in harmony with the spirit of our Constitution; the relation of a polity thus morally transformed to Western Civilization as a whole; it is with these, and kindred questions, that this volume is concerned.

## CHAPTER II.

THE RETURN OF THE CHURCH:  
 OR  
 TOWARDS A NOBLER NATIONAL INSTITUTION  
 THAN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

“ It may be said that Governments have their periods, like all things human; that they may be brought back to their primitive principles during a certain time, but that when these principles are worn out in the minds of men, it is a vain enterprise to endeavour to renew them . . . that when a house which is old and quite decayed, though often repaired, not only cracks, but totters even from the foundations, every man in his senses runs out of it, and takes shelter where he can, and that none but madmen continue obstinate to repair what is irreparable, till they are crushed in the ruin.”

From “A Letter on the Spirit of Patriotism,” by  
 VISCOUNT BOLINGBROKE, 1752.

Indistinctly as it may be recognised by the Nation as a whole, it is a commonplace among patriots in the study that we have, to-day, come to the end of a great cycle in British History, and are on the eve of a New Epoch. Such men are rapidly losing faith in the ability of the House of Commons to direct everything.

To hold this view implies no slur upon the House of Commons. It merely indicates that we have



reached a pitch of Civilization when, for the first time since the death of Oliver Cromwell, the old Tory Party has an opportunity of establishing, in a new and masterful manner, under the higher modernized conditions which exist to-day, that State and Church policy for which the Tory Party, historically speaking, stands.

For, though the reader may have forgotten it, the Tory Party, from its origin in the reign of Charles II. was the remains of that powerful "Church and King" Party by which Britain was once entirely ruled. It was the remains of a Party which, though it had been defeated at Marston Moor and Naseby, still adhered to its old faith in a disciplinary Church, and has kept alive in the heart of the Nation down to the present time, the haunting conviction that, after all, there must have been an element of truth worth preserving in those ancient principles for which a King of England was ready to die.

It is only because, since the death of Lord Beaconsfield, the policy of the Tory Party has been influenced so largely by men who have attempted hasty reform, without patiently studying our Constitution, that to day the Tory Party is leaderless, and that—though the course which it should pursue is as clear as crystal—there is discontent and unrest throughout our land. For, with inevitable certainty, a mind acquainted with our history, and with the principles of Western Civilization, must come

to the conclusion that although the House of Commons and individualistic Protestantism have been admirable instruments for destroying the theological tyranny of the Church, the regal tyranny of the Crown, and achieving that civil and religious liberty of which we are so proud ; we are to-day in need of a scientific Catholicism—a new Church Toryism—which shall save us from a fractious warfare between Plutocracy and Democracy, and which shall destroy that worship of the Currency which has taken the place of the discarded mediæval worship of Roman shrines and relics.

LORD BEACONSFIELD'S WARNING AGAINST PLACING  
UNDUE FAITH IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS AT THE  
EXPENSE OF OTHER NATIONAL INSTITUTIONS.

“ Ah ! ” cries a reader, “ that wants thinking out ! ”

Yes, sir, it does. But the more Britain quietly thinks it out the more convinced will Britain—Liberal and Conservative alike—become, that when, sixty years ago, Lord Beaconsfield—almost unaided—tried to give a social basis to the revival, then taking place, in the Church, he was assuredly right. Nothing proves more surely the wisdom of that great student of Western Civilization than his prediction, in 1835, of the state of things which would result from exaggerating the importance of one Member of the Body Politic (*i.e.*, the House of Commons) at the expense of the rest. Listen, sir, to the following from his famous “ Vindication ” of

that Constitution, of which we talk so much but consider so little. For what Lord Beaconsfield prophesied in 1835, in his *Vindication of the British Constitution*, has assuredly come to pass.

After a brilliant disquisition on the representative principle, as exhibited in Prussia and the United States, Lord Beaconsfield continues :—

“ My object hitherto, has been to prove by reference to the experience both of the Old and the New World, and of the several states of which they respectively consist, that political institutions, founded on abstract rights and principles, are merely nullities : that the only certain and legitimate foundation of liberty is law ; that if there is no privity between the old legal constitution of a country and the new legislature, the latter must fall ; and that a free government on a great scale of national representation is the very gradual work of time and especially of preparatory institutions.”

“ Throughout the whole of our history,” continues Lord Beaconsfield, “ we observe that the leading men who have directed the fortunes of our commonwealth in times of great difficulty and danger, have invariably agreed on one line of policy, namely, to eschew abstractions. But to confess the truth, I have my suspicions that the new school of statesmen, with all their affected confidence in abstract principles, with all their valorous determination to construct our coming commonwealth on a basis of

pure political science, have some misgivings that this great result is not to be entirely obtained by the influence alone of their boasted philosophy ; and I am confirmed in this by the distrustful circumstance of their simultaneously condescending, amid all their theory, to avail themselves, for the purpose of advancing their object, of a great practical misrepresentation of the form and spirit of our constitution. For it is curious to observe that, while they pretend to offer us an unfailing test of the excellence and expediency of all political institutions, they are at the same time indefatigable in promulgating the creed that the branch of our legislature, hitherto styled the House of Commons, is, in fact, the House of the People, and that the Members of that Assembly are consequently and absolutely representatives of the People. *Vox populi vox dei*, is a favourite adage, and ever on those persons' tongues : so that if the House of Commons be the House of the People, it is also the House of God ; it is omniscient and omnipotent ;—a convenient creed !”

“There was a time,” concludes Lord Beaconsfield, “when our Kings affected to rule by Divine right. It cost our forefathers dear to root out that fatal superstition. But all their heroic labours will prove worse than fruitless, if the divine right of Kings is to be succeeded by the divine right of the House of Commons. In such a belief, I, for one, see no security for our cherished liberties ; and still less a guarantee for our boasted civilization. In such a

belief it seems to me the prolific seeds are deeply sown of tyranny and of barbarism, and if this principle is to be the foundation of our future polity, it requires, in my opinion, no great gift of inspiration to foretell, that all those evils are impending for this country which are the inevitable consequences of its destinies being regulated by a vulgar and ignoble oligarchy."

Now I submit that, in the above passage, the greatest student of Statecraft (with the possible exception of Burke), who ever arose in this country, was right when he foresaw that the House of Commons, and bookish theories about "the State," would result in that House being controlled by a "vulgar oligarchy." For in maintaining that one limb of the body Politic ought not to be developed at the expense of others, Lord Beaconsfield was expressing a view which has been held by all practical statesmen from the time of Aristotle.

WE HAVE NO ESPECIAL CAUSE TO BLAME THIS OR THAT POLITICAL PARTY FOR THE FACT THAT WE HAVE COME TO THE END OF A GREAT EPOCH, AND REQUIRE A QUASI-NEW NATIONAL INSTITUTION.

Because this is so, however, I should be lacking in that grave sense of responsibility which should animate all who—in the humblest capacity—deal with public matters at a crisis, if I made the gallery-appeal that this or that political party should bear all that onus of ridicule and abuse which the Nation



is inclined to hurl upon an Institution which, though it cannot solve the Social Problem, must still remain what it arose to be, viz., our bulwark against unjust or ill-conceived Taxation.

Thoughtful persons acquainted with the history of our country will rather, I believe, support me when I submit of a recent Liberal Administration, that it has contained within its ranks in the House of Commons, a number of Members as sincerely desirous of serving what they believed to be their country's interests as any party which ever existed in that ancient House.

It would, indeed, be singularly unjust to urge that such a sincere worker among the degraded as—shall we say Mr. Masterman?—has been responsible for the misery we see around us, merely because he has happened to be a Member of the House of Commons. The House of Commons, indeed, from its very origin, never claimed to be an assembly for social re-construction or for equipping the Nation with business-like social administrators. It came into prominence, in the time of Oliver Cromwell, as an Institution peculiarly suited for creating a "Free Civilization," for *weakening* a Royalist Executive and for *destroying* the tyranny of what had been, for centuries, a *constructive*, if intolerant, Church. It did *not* come into prominence as an Institution capable of construction, nor yet of supplying the Throne with trained social administrators. On the contrary, popular election is a system for unearthing not



administrators, but orators ; and of such men Napoleon has very truly observed :

“ The great orators who rule the assemblies by the brilliancy of their eloquence, are, in general, men of the most mediocre political talents : they should not be opposed in their own way ; for they have always more noisy words at command than you. Their eloquence should be opposed by a serious and logical argument ; their strength lies in vagueness ; they should be brought back to the reality of facts ; practical arguments destroy them.” <sup>(a)</sup>

Despite this fact, however, we should, I submit, be slow to blame recent or present Members of the House of Commons, of either party, for the social distress and business immorality we see around us. It has for too long been the habit of “ the Man in the Street ”—when crops have failed or trade been bad, to blame the party in power. But such accusations have generally been unjust. It would, therefore, be far from my object in any way to cast unjust aspersions on any Member of the House of Commons for evils which are due, almost entirely, to the fact that we are smoking the fag-end of a three-centuried epoch, devoted to the pursuit of individual liberty, and wondering that it burns our lips.

It is, of course, true that Liberals who, in 1906, promised us Social Reconstruction through the House of Commons, were in the wrong. It is almost

---

(a) From Montholon's *Reminiscences of Napoleon*, vol. III., p. 187.

equally true that the Unionist who to-day sometimes talks as if Tariff Reform through the House of Commons will destroy the slum or check business immorality is no less guilty of exaggeration. But, as a matter of history, it is impractical and unjust to cast the blame for existing evils on either persons, party, or class. For a study of our past tells us that existing evils are mainly due to the fact that we have come to the close of an individualistic Epoch, that we are on the eve of a Twentieth Century Reformation; and history records the invariable rule that a new epoch is invariably ushered in by an era of a more or less critical character.

It is a happy truth that, as Civilization progresses, constitutional developments from one form of Civilization to another become less violent in character. And though the social movement, manifest in all Western countries, may appear, on the surface, to be stronger in Britain than in many countries, because we possess an abnormal town population, the intelligence of the great mass of our townsfolk is such that, if the situation is laid before them clearly, our ancient State and Church principles will carry us through, by the aid of a generous Twentieth Century Reformation, rather than a spiteful Twentieth Century Revolution.

To some the situation appears almost perilous. Thousands declare, in language which sounds strangely familiar, that they "never knew the country in such a state." But those who have studied his-

tory and recognise the steps which must be taken, know that—provided those steps are taken in time—there is no ground for alarm. For the love of order and comparative intelligence which—thanks largely to National Education—animate the bulk of the working classes, is such that our present problems will be quietly solved the moment the Nation recognises the incontestable truth that a new Epoch demands a new, or quasi-new, National Institution.

THE TESTIMONY OF EMINENT STATESMEN AS TO THE  
NEED, FROM TIME TO TIME, OF NEW OR  
QUASI-NEW, NATIONAL INSTITUTIONS.

Many volumes might, indeed, be written to illustrate the need among all peoples, of constitutional development. It will perhaps suffice, for our present purposes, if we consider a few brief but interesting passages from Mazzini, Emerson, Burke, Arnold Toynbee, Bagehot, Macaulay, Lord Rosebery, and Lord Beaconsfield, which bear directly on the greatest issue which has been placed before the people of this country since the Reformation.

First, then, I would beg the reader to note how admirably Mazzini expressed the truth that a new epoch, of an important kind, demands a new National Institution, or, as he describes it, a new “instrument.”

“The initiation of a new epoch,” says Mazzini, “which is the solemn annunciation of a new

principle—is accomplished by a revolution.\* The evolution, *i.e.*, the gradual pacific development of that principle, constitutes the subsequent life of the entire epoch. During that evolution the nations progressively adopt and employ those different elements which are their instruments of labour—their tools. Monarchies, patriciates, and priest-hoods—all these are but the instruments of the Nation, to be modified or changed according to the necessity of the times, and the greater or lesser power of service there is in them.”<sup>(a)</sup>

Emerson expresses the same truth with equal lucidity:—

“In dealing with the State,” he says, “we ought to remember that its institutions are not aboriginal, though they existed before we were born: that they are not superior to the citizen; that every one of them was once the act of a single man: every law and usage was a man’s expedient to meet a particular case: that they are all imitable, all alterable; we may make as good, we may make better. Society is an illusion to the young citizen. It lies before him in rigid repose, with certain names, men, and institutions, rooted like oak-trees to the centre,

---

\* The reader need not be alarmed by this word, as the proposals advocated in these pages are entirely of a reformatory character, calculated to put a stop to our present quasi-revolutionary conflict between Capital and Labour.

(a) From an article on M. Renan and France. English Translation in the Scott Library.

round which all arrange themselves the best they can. But the old statesman knows that society is fluid ; there are no such roots and centres ; but any particle may suddenly become the centre of the movement and compel the system to gyrate round it, as every man of strong will, like Peisistratus, or Cromwell, does for a time, and every man of truth, like Plato, or Paul, does for ever." <sup>(b)</sup>

My next quotation will be from Edmund Burke, who went further than Emerson and Mazzini, and, with the imaginative insight of genius, descried from afar that the next National Institution we should require would be a disciplinary Institution. For, when defending the principle of Church endowments, as exemplified in the Monasteries of France, Burke makes the following weighty observation.

" There are moments in the fortune of states, when particular men are called to make improvements, by great mental exertion. In those moments, even when they seemed to enjoy the confidences of their prince and country, and to be invested with full authority, they have not always apt instruments. A politician, to do great things, looks for a power—what our workmen call a purchase—and if he finds that power, in politicks as in mechanicks, he cannot be at a loss to supply it. In the monastick institutions, in my opinion, was found a *great power for the mechanism of politick benevolence*. There were

---

(b) Emerson's Essay entitled " Politics."



revenues with a publick direction ; there were men wholly set apart and dedicated to public purposes ; men without the possibility of converting the estate of the community into a private fortune ; men denied to self-interest, whose avarice is for some community, men to whom personal poverty is honour, and implicit obedience stands in the place of freedom."

"In vain," continues Burke, "shall a man look to the possibility of making such things when he wants them. The perennial existence of bodies corporate and their fortunes are things particularly suited to a man who has long views ; who meditates designs that require time in fashioning, and which propose duration when they are accomplished. He is not deserving of high rank, or even to be mentioned in the order of great statesmen, who having obtained the command and direction of such a power as existed in the wealth, the discipline, and the habits of such corporations as those which you [*i.e.* the French] have rashly destroyed, cannot find any way of converting it to the great and lasting benefit of his country. On the view of this subject a thousand uses suggest themselves to a contriving mind." (a)

In connection with Burke's references to monasteries as a "mechanism of politick benevolence," I would quote a brief sentence from Arnold

---

(a) "French Revolution."

Toynbee, whose "Industrial Revolution" has recently been issued in a popular form, with an introduction by his old college friend, Lord Milner. For Arnold Toynbee—in memory of whom Toynbee Hall was founded—was one of the greatest friends the poor and degraded in our great cities ever possessed; inasmuch as he brought that rare combination—a knowledge of both History and Economics—to bear upon the problems of Poverty. It was, then, by a perhaps unconscious development of Burke's reference to the Monasteries as sources of "politick benevolence," that Arnold Toynbee made the following brilliant observation upon which the policy outlined in these pages will be largely based.

For, speaking of a period when Altruism was discredited in favour of Self-help, Arnold Toynbee wrote as follows:—

"What we now see to be required is not the repression of the instincts of benevolence, but their organisation. *To make benevolence scientific is the great problem of the present age.*"<sup>(a)</sup>

Nor were Emerson, Mazzini, Burke, and Arnold Toynbee alone in foreseeing that in the future, as in the past, there would arise an inevitable change as to the relative importance of any given National Institution, or political principle. The late Walter Bagehot—eminent as a banker and a practical

---

(a) Toynbee's "Industrial Revolution" (Longman's), popular edition, p. 74.

business man, no less than for the lucidity of his political essays,—foresaw clearly the unsuitability of the House of Commons for constructive work, and our need for quiet reflection.

Writing about 1860, when Liberalism had, wisely or unwisely, destroyed all remaining feudal restrictions on trade, and was beginning legislative activity on new and hasty lines, Walter Bagehot, in a brilliant essay on Mr. Gladstone, said :

“ We have now reached the term of the destructive period. We cannot abolish all our laws ; we have few remaining with which educated men find fault. The questions which remain are questions of construction—how the lower classes are to be admitted to a share of political power without absorbing the whole power ; how the natural union of Church and State is to be adapted to an age of divided religious opinion, and to the necessary conditions of a parliamentary government. These, and such as these, are the future topics of our home policy. On these the voice of the nation will never be very distinct. *Destruction is easy, construction is very difficult. A statesman who will hereafter learn what our real public opinion is, will not have to yield to a loud voice, but to listen for a still small voice ; will have to seek for the opinion which is treasured in secret rather than for that which is noised abroad.*”

But not merely the above foresaw the inability of the House of Commons to reconstruct the eco-

nomie fabric of society. Its inability was most adequately foreseen by a Liberal and a Whig. For in his well-known essay on Mr. Gladstone's "Church and State," in a passage which I append in a footnote,\* Macaulay, so long ago as 1839, foresaw clearly the inability of politicians to construct, and the baneful influence of ceaseless debating activity upon the intelligence of a Statesman.

I have quoted, at some length—from the opinions of the dead, as to the varying importance, at different eras, of given National Institutions. Turning to

---

\* "A politician must often talk and act," wrote Macaulay, "before he has thought and read. He may be very ill-informed respecting a question; all his notions about it may be vague and inaccurate; but speak he must; and if he is a man of ability, tact, and intrepidity, he soon finds that, even under such circumstances, it is possible to speak successfully. He finds that there is a great difference between the effects of written words, which are perused and re-perused in the stillness of the closet, and the effect of spoken words which, set off by the graces of utterance and gesture, vibrate for a single moment on the ear. He finds that he may blunder without much chance of being detected, that he may reason sophistically, and escape unrefuted. He finds that, even on knotty questions of trade and legislation he can, without reading ten pages, or thinking ten minutes, draw forth loud plaudits, and sit down with the credit of having made an excellent speech. It is not by accuracy or profundity that men become the masters of great assemblies. Why go as deep into a question as Burke, only in order to be like Burke, coughed down, or left speaking to green benches and red boxes?

"This," continues Macaulay, "has long appeared to us

the living, surely there is no prominent public man who embodied the opinion of the present time, more happily than Lord Rosebery, when he declared at Chesterfield, some years since, that he was weary of party politics altogether, and could not worship in any existing "party tabernacle."

"Some think," he has since observed in his "Foreword" to a volume entitled *Great Japan*—by Mr. Alfred Stead—"Some think we are too old a nation for new departures; that our garment is too

---

to be the most serious of the evils which are to be set off against the many blessings of popular government. It is a fine and true saying of Bacon, that reading makes a full man, talking a ready man, and writing an exact man. The tendency of institutions like those of England is to encourage readiness in public men, at the expense both of fulness and of exactness. The keenest and most vigorous minds of every generation, minds often admirably fitted for the investigation of truth, are habitually employed in producing arguments such as no man of sense would ever put into a treatise intended for publication, arguments which are just good enough to be used once, when aided by fluent delivery and pointed language. The talent for debate is developed in such men to a degree which, to the multitude, seems as marvellous as the performance of an Italian Improvisatore. But they are fortunate, indeed, if they retain unimpaired the faculties which are required for close reasoning or for enlarged speculation. Indeed we should sooner expect a great original work on political science, such a work, for example, as the 'Wealth of Nations,' from an apothecary in a country town, or from a minister in the Hebrides, than from a statesman who, ever since he was one-and-twenty, had been a distinguished debater in the House of Commons."



old for new patches. It is true that we cannot begin on entirely new lines; we cannot, like an American manufacturer, 'scrap' all our old machinery and begin suddenly afresh. But Japan is, historically speaking, a much older nation than ours; and yet she actually did this very thing some thirty years ago: discarded nearly everything but patriotism, and began a fresh career."

"How stands it with us," continues Lord Rosebery, "in comparison with these Orientals? We have all the raw materials, some of the best. We have courage and brains and strength, but there is surely an immense leakage of power in their development. Politically speaking, we begin and end with party. We are striving to put ourselves, or our leaders, into offices or expel other people from them. This is not from want of patriotism: quite the reverse; the habit of centuries has made us believe that this is patriotism, this and no other. Do we ever stop to reflect what is the outcome of it all: the nett result of millions of words, words, words; of great debates and incessant divisions and spirited autumn campaigns? In truth, exceeding little. 'The hungry sheep look up and are not fed.' But Brown has made a fine speech, and Jones has surpassed himself, and Robinson has done less well than usual, and so we turn complacently from the long newspaper reports to the ordinary bread and cheese of life. And the old State machine

creaks on.”\*

How near, in the above passages, Lord Rosebery came to urging that we need a nobler National Institution than the House of Commons to solve those evils from which the Body Politic is suffering, it is needless to elaborate.

And now let us clinch the quotations already adduced in favour of Constitutional development with some observations made by Lord Beaconsfield, some sixty years ago, which put the whole matter in a nutshell.

“You will observe,” he said, “one curious trait in the history of this country. The depository of power is always unpopular; all combine against it, always it falls. Power was deposited in the great Barons; the Church using the King for its instrument crushed the great Barons. Power was deposited in the Church; the King, bribing the Parliament, plundered the Church. Power was deposited in the King; and the Parliament, using the People, beheaded the King, expelled the King, changed the King, and finally, for a King substituted an administrative officer. For one hundred and fifty years Power has been deposited in the Parliament, and for the last sixty or seventy years

---

\* Since the above passage was written, Lord Rosebery has come even nearer to the policy set forth in this book, and stated, in the autumn of 1908, that the Nation must look to the Church for a solution of Unemployment.

it has been becoming more and more unpopular. In 1830 it was endeavoured by a reconstruction to regain the popular affection ; but in truth, as the Parliament then only made itself more powerful, it has only become more odious. As we see that the Barons, the Church, and the King have in turn devoured each other, and that the Parliament, the last devourer, remains, it is impossible to resist the impression that this body also is doomed to be destroyed, and he is a sagacious statesman who may detect in what form and in what quarter the great consumer will arise." (a)

I must apologise for filling the earlier chapters of this volume with so many quotations : but considering the fundamental development of our Constitution, which the present juncture of our affairs demands, it is obvious that any views which we of this generation may hold, are not *alone* sufficient to warrant us in entering what is, to some extent, a new path, or rather an old path which must be relaid before we can use it. For we of this generation possess only a life-interest in our country, and are profoundly responsible to posterity.

The House of Commons seems of late to have forgotten this fact. It has attempted to achieve collective changes, which cannot be efficiently controlled and criticized by a democratic "State." It follows that in bringing forward proposals which

---

(a) Coningsby or the New Generation. Book IV. Chap. 13.

would result in the Social Problem being solved by a constructive and collective Church, rather than "the State," it is not I that am the innovator. And though I have felt it needful to support the case for constitutional advance by references to the writings of so many eminent persons, I might defend myself with equal cogency if I urged that, in attempting to re-construct the economic fabric of Society *by means of taxation*, the House of Commons and our Municipal Councils are attempting unconstitutional acts.

For the House of Commons came into prominence in the reign of Charles I. as an institution peculiarly adapted, not to construct but merely to send to the Lower House men who should criticize permanent Royalist Administrators, and *thereby save us from excessive taxation* at the hands of the Crown.

When, therefore, as to-day, the House of Commons goes far beyond its original functions and attempts nothing less than the reconstruction of the economic fabric of Society, it is undertaking functions for which it is organically and constitutionally unfitted, inasmuch as the principle of popular party election affords no guarantee that a Member of the House of Commons possesses administrative qualifications, and inasmuch as the ordinary elector can only be asked to settle the question of a juster distribution of wealth at the polls, on lines which must, in the end, spell social revolution.

## SUMMARY OF THE CASE FOR CONSTITUTIONAL ADVANCE.

The case, then, which I submit is, that while admirably fitted to vote sums for National Defence, and the maintenance of order, the House of Commons is not the place, nor are politicians the men, to solve the Social Problem.

(1) Because a new epoch invariably requires a new, or quasi-new, national Institution, nobler, in some notable particular, than the Institutions which have preceded it.

(2) Because, for what is essentially a moral task, a single lay-controlled Church which appeals to the highest altruistic motives, is—as we shall see—a more common-sense Instrument for social ends, than are half-a-dozen political parties which appeal to the conflicting self-interest of classes.

(3) Because the Social Problem is, at bedrock, the question of a more equitable distribution of wealth. And, on this delicate topic, the only Arbitrator which all classes can really respect, must manifestly be a disinterested one not engaged in furthering the interests—rightful though they may be—of Free Importing Shop-keepers, Tariff Reforming masters and men, or Trades Unionists, at the same time that it is arbitrating on the question of a juster distribution of wealth.

(4) Because, if the House of Commons, which came into prominence as an Institution peculiarly adapted to promote civil and religious liberty, is now to become an Instrument for promoting



collective morality, we shall, obviously, require another Instrument than the House of Commons to preserve a needful liberty—as the rapid disappearance of free speech and full criticism, under the closure system, most clearly denotes.

(5) Because the work which the House of Commons, now-a-days, attempts is far more than it can successfully achieve. I speak in no cantankerous spirit of that grand old House when I submit that the Directors, whether of an Insurance Company, a Hospital, or a Bank, which conducted its affairs on efficient lines, would no more dream of passing grave economic resolutions, in the middle of the night, with the light-hearted haste in which the House of Commons to-day passes Bills authorizing loans, than they would dream of expecting their Shareholders to approve of their policy as hastily as the more impetuous of our politicians seem to expect the House of Lords to ratify dozens of Bills, at the end—be it noted—of every session !

This fact is so fully appreciated by the Nation that an increasing number of citizens believe that a device must be found for relieving the House of Commons of many of its present responsibilities, and transferring them to some other body or bodies.

The proposals usually put forward in this connection are that much of the work now undertaken at Westminster should be transferred to our Municipal Representatives, or to smaller Representative Bodies in England, Scotland, Wales, and Ireland.

But before we consider at all whether it is advisable to entrust local bodies with loan-raising powers—similar to those possessed by the House of Commons—let us examine a little more closely this quite modern notion that you can only raise money for social ends by that taxation which necessitates Representative Party Government. For, when we examine carefully into matters we shall find that the principle of relying exclusively upon taxation, or loans, as the main source of raising money for social objects, is well-nigh played out: and that the time has now come when, for all social purposes, we want a National Institution which shall rely boldly for its funds on voluntary endowments, a National Institution whose Members appeal to public spirit rather than to party spite, to generosity and good-fellowship rather than to hatred and mistrust,—a National Institution whose motto shall be the good old proverb, *I never trust a gentleman by halves.*

### CHAPTER III.

#### PROTESTANT INDIVIDUALISM : OR THE CONSTITUTIONAL ORIGIN OF THE SOCIAL PROBLEM.

“One may see how the merest instalment of truth suffices so to occupy the greatest minds, that they entirely forget all the rest, and become blind to everything which does not come within the straightened horizon of their ideas ; how a mere glimpse of justice in a cause suffices to make them lose sight of all the injustice which it involves and permits.”—*Guizot*.

And now let us attempt to unravel the constitutional facts which are responsible for what is really a very extraordinary phenomenon, viz., that despite our vast growth in wealth and intelligence, we have, during the last few centuries, been unable to find any scientific device for eliminating undeserved poverty, or moralizing trade.

#### HOW MODERN COMMERCE ENTERED THE BRITISH CONSTITUTION.

Now, in old-fashioned times when the majority of our ancestors lived in the country, the Squire who abused his tenants, the housewife who did not look after her dairymaids, and the peasant who could work and refused, were all known at their true valuation by their neighbours. It is still somewhat

thus in parts of the countryside. But it is otherwise in those vast towns wherein two-thirds of our population now reside, and it is otherwise also in those parts of the countryside where the Landlord is a needless absentee, or a receiver of rents which he regards from a purely commercial rather than a neighbourly point of view.

Can one, for instance, conceive any system more calculated to foster the irresponsible use of wealth than the quite modern principle of Limited Liability, in its present form. As things are, at present, there is not the remotest human link between the rich Shareholder, or Under-writer, at one end of the town, who is the real Employer, and the wage-earner at the other end of the town or of the world ! Can one conceive any system more calculated to produce unneighbourly feelings between all classes than this ? For under it, in its precise present form, a man can shut his moral eyes to the evils which an often irresponsible use of wealth creates, under the specious plea that his Managing Director must look after the condition of employees. At the same time, the Managing Director in question is enabled to quieten his conscience with the reassuring thought that, if compelled to under-pay or over-work his assistants, he is yet consulting the interests of his Shareholders, and particularly of those Share-owning widows—so often trotted out—as if their interests were paramount.

Now, I have said that the device of Limited

Liability is quite modern. As a matter of fact, the Limited Liability Act was only passed in 1855. That is a long time ago a reader will say. Yes, but in getting at the root of such a complex evil as the Social Problem, we shall have to go back a great deal further than even 1855, and discover under what historic conditions Modern Commerce, if one might so express it, entered the British Constitution.

In other words, we must look back along the road by which our race have climbed to a state of unparalleled religious and civil liberty, accompanied by an oddly feeble business morality, and find out why it is that, to-day, the Plutocrat, or Democrat, and not the Statesman, is the real Master of Britain.

THE HOUSE OF COMMONS DOES NOT GOVERN IN  
SOCIAL AND MORAL MATTERS AS THE  
MEDIÆVAL CHURCH DID.

Ignorant persons may indeed talk about the House of Commons as being our "Government," and of Prime Ministers as "governing" this country: but, as a matter of fact, neither of them really govern in social and moral matters. They only guide. No one really governs this country, from a social and a moral point of view, for the simple reason that, just as in order to govern a factory, morally and socially, you must have a strong financial interest in it, so too, in order to govern a country socially and morally, a representative Ministry must have behind them, not merely the



right to tax, but also a strong financial interest in that country in the form of either.

(a) Large Crown Lands, such as exist, to some extent, in Germany to-day, and such as existed in Britain till the Stuarts squandered them in the seventeenth century.

(b) A vast fund of Church property—such as exists in no modern country—which they can use for moral and not merely theological ends.

With vast Crown Lands, and vast lay-controlled Catholic wealth, at their back, a capable Ministry can make some attempt to govern, socially and morally. Without it they are, to too large a degree, in the hands of the Plutocrat on the one hand, or the Demagogue on the other, both of whom should be equally avoided by a sane Nation.

The truth indeed is that in Britain, since the destruction of a land-owning mediæval Church, neither Plutocracy or Democracy have really known what it is to be governed. Certain laws have indeed been passed by Parliament, in regard to social and moral matters, but the real physical power, until a quarter of a century ago, has been in the hands of the Whigs, Middle-class Bankers, Under-writers, Shareholders, Speculators, etc., etc. ; and, since the extension of the Franchise, in the hands of Demagogues, who possess a type of mind invariably of the second order.

It has, indeed, for too long, been our habit to

regard the Reformation, our Cromwellian Revolution of 1649, the Revolution of 1688, and the Reform Bill of 1832—all of which exaggerated Parliament in the eyes of the Nation—as the greatest acts in our National History. As a matter of fact, all these “Liberal” anti-Church acts were, as Lord Beaconsfield understood, not so much National as anti-National, and in a sense, anti-Social, Acts. For they were all devised against a propertied Church, in the interests of those who had acquired, at the Reformation, her property.

The constitutional result of all these acts has been to give Parliament an undue prominence in the Constitution. In theory, Parliament has always been going to do a great many things; in practice it has succeeded in doing three, and in doing them very efficiently.

(a) It has destroyed, as it did at the Reformation when it plundered the Church, the theological intolerance of Catholicism.

(b) It has succeeded in destroying, for good or ill, the tyranny of the Crown.

(c) It has succeeded in the nineteenth century, for good or ill, in practically abolishing the direct power of that Feudal landed Aristocracy who were, in all local matters, the sharers with the Church of practical power throughout the Middle Ages.

To the large number of persons who, in every age, suppose that the art of progress consists in

attacking and, if possible, abolishing everything which is established, these achievements of the House of Commons have been ideal. On the other hand, when we turn from its destructive achievements in the direction of civil and religious liberty, to consider the social and moral aspects of history we discover the truth for which our age is waiting.

For we are now broad-minded enough to see that, despite the tendency of the Catholic-Feudal principle towards religious and civil tyranny (a tyranny which Parliament came into temporary prominence to destroy), there existed, beneath the surface of practical propertied Catholicism, perverted though its physical organization had become because it was controlled from head-quarters in a superstitious southern city—Rome—we discover, I say, that despite its abuse at the hands of southern Popes, there existed in practical propertied Catholicism moral and social “leaven” as noble as the leaven of that Liberty which Parliament and Protestant Individualism came into such prominence to promote. For—

(a) It was a propertied and practical Catholic Church which, throughout the Middle Ages, dutified, and created—out of the most barbarous and unpromising materials—that “disciplined” national character which the House of Commons, by its exclusive appeals to self-interest, is doing so much to weaken to-day.

(b) It was a propertied and practical Catholicism

which first established the sublime principle of voluntary endowments, a magic and marvellous advance upon the Greek and Roman system of taxation\* by "State" force, which we so thoughtlessly worship to-day.

(c) It was a propertied and practical Catholic Church which first established an International Church Organization for pacific, moral, and religious ends.

In other words, while it has won a brilliant victory in the realm of spiritual and intellectual freedom, individualistic, un-propertied Protestantism has been essentially plutocratic and anti-disciplinary in character, and has long failed to recognise that, though its handmaid, the House of Commons, has been an admirable Institution for destroying what became, at the hands of Southern Popes, the spiritual tyranny of constructive Catholicism, the House of Commons, has failed signally, and must, from its very nature, fail signally, in four notable points, viz. :

(1) The House of Commons—and with it the principle of popular representative State-craft—depending as it does, for its driving force, upon appeals to the self-interest of the Electorate, is

---

\*I should note that the mediæval principle of endowment was anticipated by the *Leiturgia* of Greece. There are some observations on voluntary patronage of the modern Drama in Sir Richard Jebb's *Collected Essays*, which are of interest in this connection.

unable to discipline and dutify Democracy as practical propertied Catholicism dutified the vast democratic element within her organization down to the Reformation, and as a lay-controlled propertied Catholicism will unquestionably have to discipline, and "humanize" Democracy to-day.

(2) The House of Commons is not the place, nor are party politicians the men, to arbitrate, as the Catholic Church used to arbitrate, between rich and poor, on the delicate question of a juster distribution of wealth, by encouraging the rich to endow the Church with their wealth, and using that wealth to "humanize," rather than pauperize, the socially and financially weak.

(3) The House of Commons cannot moralize modern trade. The only Institution which can hope to do this must be, as we shall see, a practical and propertied up-to-date Neo-Catholic Institution, which will have, as shareholder, but not manager, a direct financial interest in trade, and will use that interest for moral ends,

(4) The House of Commons is unable to dutify Plutocracy and encourage the principle of voluntary endowments, for social and educational ends, as an alternative to State taxation. The result is that, since the Reformation "Liberal" and anti-Catholic forms of Government in Europe and America, have, in economic matters, kept back the clock by reverting to the pre-Christian practice of State taxation,



by legal process, and Police Force, as a method of raising money, even for such benign objects as Poor Relief and Education. The evils associated with this excessive principle of State taxation have reached their climax during recent years in both Germany and Britain, while in France, where the anti-Catholic movement has reached even fuller lengths and the Church been utterly disendowed, the State, in its endeavour to raise money, has been so hard put to that it has found it needful to resort to the decadent and demoralizing method of raising it by State Lotteries.\*

#### DISRAELI'S DEFENCE OF CATHOLIC-FEUDAL ENDOWMENTS.

In order, however, to make my meaning fully clear, I had better refer to Disraeli's memorable

---

\* The development of a system, not dissimilar, has also arisen in Britain. In 1908, the Postmaster-General, in his seat in the House of Commons, commented on the advantage of Limerick competitions in enriching the State revenues, through the extensive purchase of sixpenny postal orders. He humorously added—I quote from memory—that he hoped some further form of competition which would pass the Manchester Watch Committee would arrive, to swell the revenues of the State. Without wishing to speak ungenerously of Mr. Buxton and his Liberal associates, I cannot but cordially submit that this is the “limit” of the financial results of destroying the endowments of the Church. On this principle the more a citizen gambles in quasi-State Lotteries, the more money there will be for educating his children! Can Liberals conscientiously support this principle much longer?

answer to Mr. Cobden in the year 1846.

“Gentlemen,” said Disraeli, in an address to his constituents at Shrewsbury in 1846, “we hear a great deal in the present day upon the subject of the feudal system. We have all heard how Mr. Cobden, who is a very eminent person, has said in a very memorable speech, that England was the victim of the feudal system ; and we have all heard how he has spoken of the barbarism of the feudal system, and of the barbarous relics of the feudal system. Now, if we have any relics of the feudal system, I regret that not more of it is remaining. Think one moment—and it is well you should be reminded of what this is, because there is no phrase more glibly used in the present day than ‘the barbarism of the feudal system.’ Now, what is the fundamental principle of the feudal system, gentlemen ? It is that the tenure of all property shall be the performance of its duties. Why, when the Conqueror carved out parts of the land, and introduced the feudal system, he said to the recipient, ‘*You shall have that estate, but you shall do something for it: you shall feed the poor ; you shall endow the Church; you shall defend the land in case of war ; and you shall execute justice and maintain truth to the poor for nothing.*’ ”

“It is all very well,” continued Disraeli, “to talk of the barbarities of the feudal system, and to tell us that in those days, when it flourished, a great variety of gross and grotesque circumstances and great

miseries occurred ; but these were not the result of the feudal system : they were the result of the barbarism of the age. They existed not from the [Catholic] feudal system, but in spite of the feudal system. The principle of the feudal system, the principle which was practically operated upon, was the noblest principle, the grandest, the most magnificent and benevolent that was ever conceived by sage, or ever practised by patriot. Why, when I hear a political economist, or an anti-Corn-Law Leaguer, or some conceited Liberal reviewer, come forward and tell us, as a grand discovery of modern science, twitting and taunting, perhaps, some unhappy squire who cannot respond to the alleged 'discovery'—when I hear them say, as the great discovery of modern science, that 'Property has its duties as well as its rights,' my answer is that that is but a feeble plagiarism of the very principle of that feudal system which you are always reviling—and when I see masses of property raised in this country which do not recognise that principle; when I find men making fortunes by a method which permits them (very often in a very few years) to purchase the lands of the old territorial aristocracy of the country, I cannot help remembering that those millions are accumulated by a mode which does not recognise it as a duty 'to endow the Church, to feed the poor, to guard the land, and to execute justice for nothing.' And I cannot help asking myself, when I know that evidence exists in our

Parliament of a state of demoralization in the once happy population of this land, which is not equalled in the most barbarous countries—I cannot help suspecting that this has arisen because property has been permitted to be created and held without the performance of its duties.”

#### NETT RESULT OF PROTESTANT INDIVIDUALISM IN SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC MATTERS.

To sum up, the nett result of Protestant Individualism has, in social and moral matters, been that during the last few hundred years, Britain has scarcely been governed in social or moral matters at all. It has, since the Reformation, merely been “guided” by such fluctuating ideas as have floated through the varying intelligence, or appealed to the varying interests, of those who have paid the taxes or owned Stock in the National Debt.

It follows that, while we possess civil and religious liberty to an unparalleled degree, our advance in morality, and especially in business morality, has not kept pace with our advance in wealth and intelligence. Why is this? Why are we so comparatively intelligent as a people, but have a business morality so exceedingly primitive as to be well-nigh pagan?

#### ORIGIN OF MODERN BUSINESS IMMORALITY.

The answer is both interesting and obvious, and affords us the only statesmanlike solution of the

Social Problem. It is that all that is implied by spiritual religion, and by the word "intelligence" are, to a large degree, individual affairs, which necessitate civil and religious freedom. A man can be as intelligent as the grey matter in his brain allows him to be, if he lives in a country where freedom is allowed to the Press, and mingles bouts of hard reflection with periods of practical activity among his fellows. Similarly, it is possible for a man, living alone, to possess the keenest spiritual appreciation. But it is otherwise with morality. Morality — and especially business morality — is hardly an individualistic affair at all. For if a man is—in the words of our old Church Catechism—to be "true and just in all his dealings," he must not be wholly free. On the contrary, he must act in concert with practically all his fellows. Business is such a complex affair that one man who under-pays or under-sells, upsets the whole delicately-poised scheme of trade, and compels everyone else also to become untrue and unjust in their dealings, or else go, financially, to the wall. It follows that it is not wholly unfair to say that Individualistic Protestantism is too closely associated with the man whose motto is "finish sanding the sugar and then come down to prayers."

To sum up, nothing will ever really solve business immorality but co-operation among all business men, assisted by a practical Lay-controlled Catholicism, whose object will be, by peaceful,



altruistic, devices, to create and maintain a business morality; but an Institution, as we shall see later, which must be properly checked by the State from going to extremes.

#### POST-REFORMATION AND PRE-REFORMATION TRADE.

To a clear understanding, then, of our present immoral methods of business, it is necessary for the modern citizen to appreciate the difference between modern business methods which arose after the destruction of Church Property and those which existed before. This difference consisted in the fact that pre-Reformation trade was almost entirely local and was moralised, jointly, by the protective guild and the Church.

In other words, it was possible, in old Catholic days, for a business man to be "true and just in all his dealings" with the co-operation merely of the men who lived in the same town as himself. The result was that, in their business dealings, the men of the Middle Ages were in a position to be, if they chose, better advanced, as regards business morality, than we are to day: though, at the same time, as regards civil and religious liberty, they were far behind us.

Why, then, was it that, as our Elizabethan Church Catechism implies, they did endeavour *to be true and just in all their dealings*, in a way that we make such a flimsy attempt to be "true and just" to-day? It was because, in those barbarous times, the pro-

tective Guild principle was moralized by a powerful propertied Church which, though narrow in spiritual and intellectual matters, and narrow also in moral matters, was yet in a position to enforce a crude business morality, which was infinitely in advance of anything that prevailed outside the barriers of Christendom.\* It was because, through nine centuries, the Church encouraged the barbarous nations of Europe to affix fair prices to their goods in local markets, and forbade the lending of money on usury at all.

In thus forbidding usury the Mediæval Church was not so foolish as might, at first sight, appear. Trade, as has been said, was almost entirely local in character, and, owing to a number of causes, especially the scarcity of coin and facilities of transit, the lending of money on usury was far less

---

\* The Church made its influence felt in every-day life to a greater extent than to-day. The guilds of which we have been speaking felt its influence. They were not merely commercial but also religious bodies. The townsman was admitted to the membership of the guild of his craft with religious ceremonies: he attended the chapel where stood the guild altar. There were rules of charity and neighbourliness among guildsmen. Such members were to be helped and visited; in the event of their death their families were aided by the guild. "Men lived," says Wakeman (*History of the Church of England*), "in the Middle Ages under a great sense of the claims of the Christian Society upon them. It is this which makes the great difference in the attitude of the Laity to religion in the Middle Ages and in subsequent centuries."

possible or necessary than to-day. In the Middle Ages, money was indeed lent on interest mainly for non-productive objects, such as war: and trade, in the form of usury, was only permitted to the Jews, who were under the direct control of the Crown.

It was, however, their misfortune and ours that, when, at the Reformation, our ancestors destroyed the power of the old Catholic Church with her wealth and her Ecclesiastical Courts for trying moral offenders, they had not, as we have, reached a stage when they could distinguish scientifically between the spiritual and moral aspects of Religion.

Our ancestors confused these aspects together in a hopelessly unscientific fashion, as a few of us do still. They were alas! unable to recognise that, while it is good to have spiritual and intellectual freedom, to hold those views on Heaven and human destiny, which you believe to be true, it is distinctly different in regard to moral freedom.

While, therefore, our ancestors were right enough in destroying, at the Reformation, the spiritual and intellectual intolerance of the Church, they were not, I submit, so right in destroying her moral intolerance, and the time has, long since, come when, leaving existing Churches free to promote the spiritual and intellectual aspects of Religion, we want, not Street-controlled Socialism, but Lay-controlled Catholicism to moralize trade and housing. To effect this we require a strong

Churchward movement which shall result in the voluntary endowment of a Lay-controlled Church Institution with enough land and wealth to make its moral power really felt. At the same time we must leave it to what used to be, and ought to remain, the champion of Liberty—*i.e.*, the House of Commons—to see that such a Neo-Catholic Institution does not abuse its power.

#### THE CONSTITUTIONAL ORIGIN OF THE SOCIAL PROBLEM IN BRITAIN.

The reader, then, who has carefully followed the historical process which I have tried to describe, will, by this time, understand that the real origin of the Social Problem in Britain is due to the fact that modern Commerce entered the British Constitution at the worst possible time. For trade ceased to be local and Catholic-influenced, and began to be national and capitalistic, just at the precise moment when that mighty Catholic Organization—which, if it had been scientific, might have admitted the Laity into its counsels, and used its vast wealth to moralize modern trade—was shivered into contending fragments.\*

---

\*I need scarcely remind the reader that this was precisely Lord Beaconsfield's view as to the historical origin of the Social Problem. Let me give two exceedingly interesting quotations in this connection. First, as to our Protestant Plutocracy :—

“It is in the plunder of the Church,” wrote Lord Beaconsfield, in *Coningsby* (Book II. Chap. I.) “that we



## HOW COMMERCE ENTERED THE GERMAN CONSTITUTION.

It will illustrate the above conclusions if we compare the anti-Catholic conditions under which Modern Commerce entered the British Constitution, with those under which it entered the German Constitution, and the American Constitution. I shall do this very briefly, and do not claim to deal at all closely with these two comparisons; but students of History and Economics will, I believe, agree that my rough account approximates to the truth.

---

must seek for the primary cause of our political exclusion, and our commercial restraint. That unhallowed booty created a factitious aristocracy, ever fearful that they might be called upon to regorge their sacrilegious spoil. To prevent this they took refuge in political religionism, and paltering with the disturbed consciences or the pious fantasies of a portion of the people, they organized them into religious sects. These became the unconscious Pretorians of their ill-gotten domains. At the head of these religionists, they have continued ever since to govern, or powerfully to influence, this country. They have in that time pulled down thrones and churches, changed dynasties, abrogated and remodelled parliaments; they have disfranchised Scotland, and confiscated Ireland. One may admire the vigour and consistency of the Whig party, and recognise in their career that unity of purpose that can only spring from a great principle; but the Whigs introduced sectarian religion, sectarian religion led to political exclusion, and political exclusion was soon accompanied by commercial restraint."

In the second place, here are Lord Beaconsfield's views as to the Whig Revolution of 1688, as expressed in his historical romance *Sybil* (Book I. Chap. III.).

"If it be a salutary principle in the investigation of



First, then, be it noted, that Modern Commerce, while it had existed, to some extent, for two hundred years, may fairly be described as having entered the British Constitution, in its most up-to-date form, at 1760. This, at any rate, is the date selected by Arnold Toynbee as inaugurating the *Industrial Revolution*, when a Capitalist Factory System was started, when Capitalist methods and machinery were first applied to Agriculture, and when the abnormal British town began to arise. This was,

---

historical transactions, to be careful in discriminating the cause from the pretext, there is scarcely any instance in which the application of this principle is more fertile in results than in that of the Dutch invasion in 1688. The real cause of this invasion was financial. The Prince of Orange had found that the resources of Holland, however considerable, were inadequate to sustain him in his internecine rivalry with the great sovereign of France. In the authentic conversation which has descended to us, held by William III, at the Hague with one of the prime abettors of the invasion, the prince did not disguise his motives; he said, "Nothing but such a constitution as you have in England can have the credit that is necessary to raise such sums as a great war requires." The prince came and used our constitution for his purpose; he introduced into England the system of Dutch finance. The principle of that system was to mortgage industry in order to protect property; abstractedly, nothing can be conceived more unjust; its practice in England has been equally injurious. In Holland, with a small population engaged in the same pursuits, in fact, a nation of bankers, the system was adapted to the circumstances which had created it. All shared in the present spoil, and therefore, could endure the future burthen. And so to this day Holland is sustained, almost solely sustained, by the vast

so to speak, the psychological moment when the Church, or failing the Church, the Crown, ought—so to speak—to have returned, though in a modernised way. This was the psychological moment when the Church, taking the Laity into her counsel, ought to have raised large voluntary funds, purchased the land on which our miserably congested towns have been built, without regard to the relation between overcrowding and moral health. This was the psychological moment when the Church, taking the

---

capital thus created which still lingers among its dykes. But applied to a country in which the circumstances were entirely different, to a considerable and rapidly increasing population, where there was a numerous peasantry, a trading middle-class struggling into existence, the system of Dutch finance, pursued more or less for nearly a century and a half, has ended in the degradation of a fettered and burthened multitude. Nor have the demoralized consequences of the funding system on the more favoured classes been less decided. It has made debt a national habit ; it has made credit the ruling power, not the exceptional auxiliary, of all transactions ; it has introduced a loose, inexact, haphazard, and dishonest spirit in the conduct of both public and private life ; a spirit dazzling and yet dastardly ; reckless of consequences and yet shrinking from responsibility. And in the end, it has so overstimulated the energies of the population to maintain the material engagements of the State, and of society at large, that the moral condition of the people has been entirely lost sight of. A mortgaged Aristocracy, a gambling foreign commerce, a home trade founded on a morbid competition and a degraded people ; these are great evils, but ought perhaps cheerfully to be encountered for the great blessings of Civil and Religious Liberty."

Laity into her counsel, ought to have become a Shareholder, though not—mark you—a working Organizer, in industry. But at this, the psychological moment, Dissent and anti-Nationalism were, alas! all powerful, and the Church was as weak as it could conceivably be, nor had she wholly lost her spiritual intolerance. This was the psychological moment when, failing the Church, the Crown in Britain might have stepped in and done something to compel both masters and men to recognise a few, at any rate, of the laws of physical health.

It is in this particular that Britain differs from Germany. For modern commerce did not enter the German Constitution until long after it had entered the British Constitution. It entered the German Constitution to find the Church morally weak, but to find the Crown very strong, and in Bismarck, all classes found a man imbued with a "Tudor" conception of the religious functions of Kingship,\* who represented them in a way that no King of England and no Prime Minister has done, in this country, since the times of Burleigh, and

---

\* Mr. Cecil Headlam expresses this truth admirably in his description of Bismarck's boyhood ("Heroes of the Nations" Series, pp. 11-13):—

"Here in the deep seclusion of the country the boy passed his first years . . . far from the bustle and turmoil of civilization. In this distant Province life went on little altered by the changes which had transformed the State . . . The King was chief bishop, as he was general of the army, and the functions of the Church were transferred to the Crown."

Strafford, despite Bolingbroke's passionate plea, in the eighteenth century, for a "patriot King."

Let me give three instances. First there is the well-known case of Bismarck's scheme for compulsory Old-Age Pensions, and Insurance against sickness. By this scheme Bismarck used the religious influence of the Crown to compel both master and man to make provision against a rainy day—a moral quasi-Christian System of Old-Age Pensions, and not, like ours, a pagan and a pauperizing one, with little to differentiate it from the spirit of the doles which corrupted Greece and Rome.

Secondly, there has been compulsory military training which compelled all Germans to serve their country in person and not rely exclusively on a mercenary army or fleet.

Third, one might take such an instance as the provision of Public Baths in Germany, which are not paid for out of rates, but are provided by Society: *i.e.*, by masters and men, who are compelled by the Crown to provide them, in the region of their factories. This is also, in a sense, a Christian measure. For it draws masters and men together, and teaches them to recognise mutual duties.\*

---

\* "The German Factory Laws require facilities for washing to be provided in most industrial establishments, but many employers go further and add shower-baths, which may be used by the men at stated hours in turn.



Now these pages do not advocate Bismarckian methods of social reform as likely, in all points, to be most effective in Britain. As those who point us to the German "State" forget, we are far and away ahead of Germany—constitutionally. I therefore submit that, what we want in this country is a strong but conciliatory Church Policy.

In a country where the Laity are so intelligent and independent, moral compulsion exercised by Society through a Neo-Catholic Church will be more effective, morally speaking, than compulsion exercised from above by the State. For man is a moral being and not a machine: and if social ends are best achieved by social means

---

Sometimes a nominal charge of a half-penny or a penny is made, but usually they are free, and some employers even give their men twenty minutes or half an hour once a week in which to use the bath, which is supplied with cold, tepid, or hot water at wish. The wash bowls and troughs are largely used both at the noon interval and the evening break, for a German workman has an aversion to being seen on the streets soiled with the dust and grime of the workshop. A changing room, with lockers for all the men, is a common feature of a factory or workshop, and here the out-of-door clothes are replaced by working attire. So much importance is attached to cleanliness and orderliness of appearance that apprentices are required on compulsion to do what their elders do voluntarily. "My foremen have instructions," said one large ironmaster, "to send back to the wash-trough any lad who is seen leaving the yard dirty."

W. H. Dawson, *The Evolution of Modern Germany*  
(Fisher Unwin), page 152.



“State” coercion should be, in Britain, the last resort of the Statesman who would effect social changes.

The instance of Germany is here referred to mainly because it is surely obvious, as Bolingbroke foresaw,\* that a hundred-and-forty years ago, when we were, constitutionally, in much the same position as Bismarckian Germany, and when such an one as George III. could exercise a marked influence over his country's destiny, it was to our misfortune that the Georges were Hanoverian aliens, not strong enough, or wise enough, to care, as does our present Monarch and his Consort, for the social welfare of the people.

But more than this. What we call “the State” in Germany is a totally different Institution from what “the State” has been in Britain since Tudor times. “The State” in Germany is more like “the State” was in Britain in Tudor times, before our Crown Lands were dissipated, and when a King of England was by far the largest landowner in the country. In Prussia alone at the present time, the value of State or Crown Forest lands, mines, and

---

\* “Those who live to see such happy days, and to act in so glorious a scene, will perhaps call to mind, with some tenderness of sentiment, when he is no more, a man, who contributed his mite to carry on so good a work, and who desired life for nothing so much as to see a king of Great Britain, the most popular man in his country, and a Patriot King at the head of an united people.”—

Concluding section of the *Patriot King*.

railways, is fourteen-hundred million pounds. These represent Germany's assets as against her National Debt, which is some eight-hundred millions.

We, on the other hand, possess a National Debt of some seven-hundred odd millions, but our assets merely amount to Crown Lands which bring in a beggarly £50,000 a year, and a few Suez Canal Shares which Lord Beaconsfield had the courage to purchase, at his own initiative, and which have since immensely risen in value.

WHY GERMAN METHODS OF SOCIAL REFORM THROUGH  
 "THE STATE" ARE NOT WHOLLY APPLICABLE  
 IN BRITAIN.

Those persons, therefore, who are constantly pointing us to Germany, and to German "State" ideals of social reform as applicable to this country seem to be, to a large extent, book-worms, or neurotic force-at-any-price people. For what we have surely to do in *this* country, if we want to solve the Social Problem, *is to consider those assets which we possess and which Germany does not*. For we possess a growing system of making voluntary gifts and bequests to Charities, to the tune of many millions a year.

It is, I submit, by using those voluntarily bequeathed millions scientifically through a wealth-owning, Lay-controlled Church, quickening, by a bold appeal to honour, the spirit which makes men ready to make vast bequests at death,—or, better

still during life—that Britannia must solve the Social Problem. And, in so doing, she will be opening up a new constitutional phase in the history of the world, which will be infinitely ahead of any German State methods of Social Reform introduced from above by “State” force.

Whatever State Collectivism, therefore, may have arisen, or may in the future arise, in Germany, it is surely manifest that, in organizing the increasingly powerful spirit of voluntary Altruism, throughout a wealth-owning Church, we shall, in both Britain and America, steam simply knots ahead of anything that has been, or can be, achieved socially by compulsory State Altruism in Germany.

Nevertheless, in looking back over our history, and remembering that the Factory System was not introduced into Germany on any large scale until long after it was introduced into Britain, we see that when Modern Commerce entered the German Constitution it met Bismarck, who did something to moralize it, whereas, when Modern Commerce entered the British Constitution, which it did in a sense about 1760, and in a greater degree at the opening of the 19th century, it met, not a British Bismarck, but a House of Commons which was the tool of the Financier and the Factory Owner, who made a fetish of Commercial Freedom.

This, then, is the difference between the British and the German Constitutions. For those who have

studied all that Bismarck did for the working classes of Germany, know that—as the power behind the Throne—he was more representative of their true interests than any Elective Assembly which ever existed, or which ever will exist. For Prince Bismarck—unlike an Elective Assembly—was not a party man; and in his own masterful phraseology, declared :—

“While I have been Minister I have never belonged to any party, either Liberal or Conservative. My party consisted solely of the King and myself”<sup>(a)</sup>

As against this, on the other hand, it is an open and singularly interesting question, how far, if the Crown finds no fit successor to Bismarck, and becomes in consequence, less representative of the interests of all, Germany, having dropped her Royalist “pilot,” and substitutes, as she seems on the eve of doing, Cabinet for Royalist methods in choosing Ministries, will find her Social Problem becoming more acute than to-day.

It will also be of interest to note what part, under a purely elective principle of Government, the vast crowd of State officials who exist in Germany will play at the polls, how far “State” railways will succeed in the long run, how far Germany’s State officials will be satisfied with a system of fixed pay, and how far Bureaucracy really makes, in commercial affairs, for leadership by the

---

(a) Busch’s “Bismarck” (Macmillan), vol. II. p. 453.

commercially fittest.\*

These, it may be argued, are questions upon which one can merely speculate, and which are, therefore, of a purely academic interest. But it is surely by comparing our Constitution to that of our neighbours that we shall each understand the other's needs, and those principles which are bound, in the end, to forge a link between all Nations, throughout Western Europe, through the medium, not of self-interest and "the State," but of self-sacrifice and that modernized Catholicism, towards which Germany, like ourselves, is unquestionably moving.

#### HOW COMMERCE ENTERED THE AMERICAN CONSTITUTION.

Let us now turn briefly to America, and see wherein the introduction of modern commerce into the American Constitution differed from the introduction of modern commercial methods into Britain. Nominally, there is a certain outward resemblance between the British and American Constitutions, though the American Constitution is a written one. For the American Senate bears a distant resem-

---

\* Walter Bagehot has the following interesting observation on Bureaucracy.

"A dead, inactive, agricultural country may be governed by an unalterable bureau for years and years, and no harm come of it. If a wise man arranged the bureau rightly in the beginning, it may run rightly a long time. But if the country be a progressive, eager, changing one, soon the bureau will either cramp improvement, or be destroyed itself."

*The English Constitution* (Kegan Paul) p. 199.



blance to the British House of Commons. What, then, is the economic difference between the United States and the Britain of to-day ?

The difference is, in the first instance, might one suggest, that the real strength of the American Constitution does not lie in the American Senate and the elective principle, but in that territorial principle in accordance with which such a large section of the community in America are scattered over the land, lending—as an agricultural population always does—stability and strength to the Body Politic.

In the second place, the vast extent of adjacent territory in the United States, stretching, as they do, across a whole continent, has resulted in the fact that capital in the United States has not gone abroad to such an extent as with ourselves, to countries where white labour cannot follow it. This end has been further secured by Protection.

But for these two factors, it need scarcely be said that America shows, in the clearest fashion, the inability of an anti-Church ideal of Government to moralize trade. Such attempts as are made to tackle the Social Problem in New York, for instance, in the form of “moral” Leagues of Consumers, who only purchase goods which are made under righteous conditions, are, I need scarcely point out, a recognition of the breakdown of “State” Government, and a return, under modernized lines, to old

Catholic principles, whereby the community are organized—on Neo-Catholic lines—for Altruism. And there can surely be little doubt that the real answer to the problem of “the American Constitution *versus* the Trusts” will be found, *not* in any big-stick methods of force, but rather in bold but gentle devices, whereby the Millionaire Trust-owner will, before so many years, be generous enough, in response to public opinion, voluntarily to bequeath to a Neo-Catholic Institution enough wealth to make it a permanent Shareholder—but not a Manager—of the Trusts, using its annual interest to finance Education, and make the home the basis of social reform.

In this connection I note that, in a recently-published volume of reminiscences, Mr. Rockefeller—who has already given away many millions in charity—is urging that what he calls a “Trust,” should be established to receive charitable bequests and utilize them wisely. It need scarcely be said that this is in the direction of the policy advocated in these pages, though what Mr. Rockefeller describes as a “Trust,” I describe as a “Neo-Catholic Institution,” to be controlled by Society as organized for social service: *i.e.* by both Clergy and Laity. The only difference between own views probably being that Mr. Rockefeller has not studied the past history of the Church; and does not therefore see what he will perhaps agree to be the close historical connection which exists between his proposal and the past history of Christendom.

Lastly, it is surely not unfair to regard those "Child Courts" first happily established in America, for the special purpose of trying child offenders, as the beginning, in America, of a return, on Neo-Catholic lines, to the old Ecclesiastical Courts of the Church.

#### SUMMARY.

Why, then, let us ask ourselves, are the Church and the Crown better Institutions for solving the Social Problem than is a Parliament governed by groups? How can the Church and the Crown really represent the interest of the poor, in a way that a Parliament cannot?

First, then, as regards the Crown. How can the Crown represent the poor better than a Parliament? The answer is that the Crown, and a Bismarckian Executive under a patriot king can, within limits, represent, and really help the working classes, because, in all its legislation, it takes into account, as Bismarck did, the rightful interest of *all classes*, and does not, as a class political party is, from its very nature, bound to do, pass class legislation; which creates a spirit of ill-will between class and class.

Second, the Church: what of the Church? How, and why, is a practical propertied Church an even better Institution than the Crown for uplifting the degraded? For a vast number of reasons which I shall slowly elaborate later; as, for instance:—

(1) A practical, propertied, Lay-controlled Church is an Institution which is infinitely more representative—not merely of the working classes—but also of the women of Britain, and that great estate of the Nation, who can never vote ; viz., the children.

(2) Because a practical, propertied, and really National, Church, such as we have not had since the Reformation, is an Institution which can consider the righteous interests of all classes.

(3) Because the Social Problem, being essentially a moral problem, can be best solved by a practical propertied Church which is not relying for her driving-force—as are our political parties—upon the self-interest of Free Traders, Tariff Reformers, or the paid agents of Trade Unionism.

(4) Because a practical propertied Church is the one and only Institution (save the Crown or a National Bismarck) around which all classes can rally.

(5) Because a strong, practical, propertied Church can ask Plutocracy for voluntary gifts, or bequests, of land, houses, shares, etc., whereas the House of Commons can only acquire them by that legislative force, which, as in the case of a recent Budget, creates almost equally virulent opposition. For, as Milton learned by experience in the Civil War, and later wrote—

“ Who overcomes

“ By force hath overcome but half his foe.”<sup>(a)</sup>

---

(a) “Paradise Lost,” Book I. p. 649.

It follows that the new National Institution—nobler than the House of Commons—which we require for the solution of social ills and business immorality, must be a Neo-Catholic Institution: *i.e.* a Church whose endowments will be controlled by a preponderance of the lay element, and be used to moralize trade and housing—a Church which will leave the spiritual welfare of the people to be administered to as at present and allow existing endowments—both Church of England and Non-conformist—to remain intact to that end.

In conclusion, may I note that the need for such a step as that advocated in these pages, was half hinted at by Lord Beaconsfield in a brilliant address to Churchmen in 1862, entitled, “The Future of the Church.” In this address Lord Beaconsfield pointed out that what was required was a closer understanding between the Church of England and Nonconformity—for the Church of England to assert her nationality—and for the further development of the Lay-Element in the administration of affairs which are not of a spiritual character.

“We must,” said Lord Beaconsfield, “erase from the mind of the country the idea that the Church is a clerical corporation. The Church is a National Corporation, of which the clerical element, however important, is only a small element; and except—a great exception no doubt—administering to us of sacred things, there is nothing that concerns the



Church in which it is not alike the privilege and the duty of laymen to take an active part."

It is, I submit, by carefully developing these principles that we shall alone solve the Social Problem, and discipline both Plutocracy and Democracy. For the Social Problem is a moral problem, and is not to be solved by a squabble between capital and labour, but only, as I shall slowly try to shew, by a propertied Church which, by becoming a Landlord and a Shareholder, moralizes both Plutocracy and Democracy, and teaches them both—by her practical example—to do their duty.

## CHAPTER IV.

### CATHOLIC COLLECTIVISM : OR THE CONSTITUTIONAL CURE OF THE SOCIAL PROBLEM.

“Let Parliament proceed with its ordinary work, without leaving, at every step it takes, a bitter resentment to dog its footsteps.”

LORD SALISBURY, Oct. 17th, 1872.

#### ILLUSTRATION OF NEO-CATHOLIC AS OPPOSED TO POLITICAL METHODS OF SOCIAL REFORM.

It will make clear our need—for purposes of social service—of a nobler National Institution, than is the House of Commons, if we take the definite case of a recent attempt on the part of the House of Commons, to promote morality by means of a Licensing Bill, and go straight for the vital point by quoting from the speech with which Lord Crewe—the Liberal Leader in the Upper House—introduced the Bill in question to the Lords.

“I do not believe,” said Lord Crewe, “that it is possible to engage in any scheme of social reform, on any subject, without causing inconvenience to

some person. Whether your object is the better housing of the people or social improvement in any direction, you cannot proceed without causing inconvenience, and I should like to say that if this great problem is to be dealt with there must be, beyond inconvenience, something of that spirit of sacrifice mentioned in the majority report."

Lord Crewe was surely right. Obviously there must be self-sacrifice—and a vast amount of it—if we are to sweep away our slums, regenerate Democracy, and, among other things, endeavour to create conditions which shall discourage excessive drinking. Where I demur, in a spirit of sympathy rather than malevolence, from Lord Crewe and his Party, and where, I am assured, the thoughtful element in the Country, without ill-will, demurs, is that we feel it is the duty of a Church to preach self-sacrifice and not of a Political Party, even if "a majority report" has suggested that a political party is the best instrument for such an end.

What the thoughtful element in the Nation—I will not say resents—but what puzzles it so is the idea that it is the duty of salaried Cabinet Ministers in power to preach self-sacrifice to the party out of power at the point of the sword. What the intelligent element in the Nation cannot quite grasp, for instance, is why Mr. Winston Churchill—who is not a teetotaller—should have been able to score a party point at Manchester against Mr. Joynson Hicks, who was a staunch teetotaller, on the ground

that he (Mr. Churchill) was fostering temperance by compelling the Brewers to make sacrifices for the cause of temperance : while at the same time, Mr. Churchill does not—so far as we know—make any personal sacrifice of salary in order to help the Brewers to reform the public-house.

In submitting this on behalf of the thoughtful I do not remotely call in question the public spirit of Lord Crewe or Mr. Churchill. On the contrary, the keen sense of humour of both these gentlemen is such that they will I am sure, with all good humour, support my contention—that, if Cabinet Ministers are to promote self-sacrifice, then Cabinet Ministers must obviously accept the salaries of country curates, with certain additional “considerations” in lieu of the fact that events over which they have no control, have, sometimes, a habit of abbreviating their temporary “benefices.”

Weighty, indeed, were the reasons brought forward in favour of a recent Licensing Bill. But the real humour of an ideal whereby that Liberal party which exists to-day so largely to promote the financial interests of the Free Importer, promotes self-sacrifice among “Conservative” Brewers, will be most fully appreciated, if we suppose that the Conservative Party should deliver a counter-attack by promoting self-sacrifice among “Liberal” Grocers.

Among the many evils which fester in our great towns at the present time one of the very gravest

is indeed the indifferent quality of the food and grocery which is sold at too many of the small grocery establishments in the slum quarters of our great cities. Nay, among the numerous reasons which lead the more degraded of our fellow-countrymen to begin the dangerous habit of impairing their flagging vitality by excessive indulgence in alcohol, one of the most important is unquestionably that the food they eat does not really nourish them. In addition to this, many of our slum-dwellers, compelled, as too many of them are, to purchase in pennyworths, have to purchase, at these small shops, what is, too often, the refuse from the Big Grocer's, at a price which implies that, purchasing in pennyworths, they pay what might fairly be called a Poverty Tariff of from 12 to 50 per cent. upon inferior food, candles, coal, etc.

Now it is not, I believe, unfair to submit that these small provision dealers, who are frequently the helpless creditors of the big provision merchants, are as closely associated with the Liberal Party as are the Brewers associated with the Conservative Party. For otherwise the Liberal Party would obviously have included in their Licensing Bill a scheme for lessening the number of Grocer's Licences, which are, I understand, such a source of secret drinking among women. Such, at any rate, I take it, is Mr. Churchill's view. For, in a recent speech, I think it was at Nottingham, I distinctly remember that, when speaking to his Liberal friends about the



advantages of a recent Old Age Pensions Act, Mr. Churchill informed his Liberal associates of the benefits which would accrue as the result of five-shilling pensions filtering through the community, and quickening trade in the "small shops."

Now, to anyone who has studied it, this question of the Food Supply in slums is one of the most important aspects of the Social Problem. It is, indeed, essential that the food of all classes should be pure, wholesome, and obtainable at righteous prices. What, however, one is compelled reluctantly to point out is, that supposing this great Food Question in slums were to be taken up and exploited by Conservatives, in the same manner that the Liberals have taken up and exploited the Drink Question, what a magnificent case the Conservative street-placarding Party would have against what they would describe as "the bloated 'Liberal' Grocer!"

What a magnificent case might be made out of "grandmother" sitting up, the last thing at night, to read her Bible by the flickering light of a candle on which—purchasing in pennyworths—she has paid a Radical Poverty Tariff, as she does, of 12 per cent.! What a telling "poster" might be made of some unhappy little maiden spreading a slice of her "Big Loaf" with jam, on which her mother had paid (as purchasing in pennyworths from the small Radical Grocer, she does) a Radical Poverty

Tariff—even in Free Importing Britain—of no less than 50 per cent.!

Similarly, what inglorious placards we might see of the big Radical Grocer who makes the small one's shop a receptacle into which he "tilts" his "rubbish." Liberals call the Brewer "Bung," and represent him on their placards as the possessor of an abnormally red nose. Conservatives would retort by describing the big Radical Grocer as "Belly," and would represent him on all *their* placards as the possessor of a portentous paunch. Finally, recognising that the small Radical grocer, and the wholesale importer of salted foreign dairy produce are as anxious to promote their idea of Liberalism as are the Brewers to promote their idea of Conservatism, how tartly Conservative invective might end up with a retort to Lord Rosebery's somewhat hasty observation that "if the State does not control the Liquor Traffic the Liquor Traffic will control the State," by the equally specious assertion "down with 'Belly,' 'Belly' is a National Curse: if the Body Politic does not control 'Belly' and his beastly foreign butter, 'Belly' will control the Body Politic."

Now here I must pause, for a Liberal reader will declare:—

"Yes, yes, yes: what you say is all very well, but if you expect a big Provision Merchant to help you or anyone else to tackle the Food Question in slums, you must be more tactful with him. Why call him 'Belly'; and describe him as a National Curse?"

Well, sir, that is just what—in all good humour—I ask you! Why do you call the Brewer “Bung,” and slander him?

To make the situation fully clear, suppose for a moment that you were the wealthy owner of a large number of Brewing or Grocery shares, and that a movement was on foot for tackling the Food Question and the Drink Question in slums.

In the first case, let us suppose that a Neo-Catholic Institution, under the presidency of Her Majesty the Queen—as representing the Mothers of Britain—and supported by Churchmen and Social Workers of all classes, were to make a bold united appeal to you and asked you, as the wealthy owner of Brewing or Grocery shares, for the sake of the unhappy little mortals in our slums, voluntarily to endow their Neo-Catholic Institution with shares, so that it should eventually acquire a powerful interest in Brewing and Grocery, throughout the country, at the cost of deliberate self-sacrifice on your part, what would you reply?

There can be little doubt that, after thinking the matter well over, you would come to the conclusion that if the Social Problem is really to be solved, it can, as Lord Crewe so truly says, only be solved by self-sacrifice. And, that being so, an Institution controlled by Altruists rather than Politicians, is the only Institution for promoting self-sacrifice which you could respect. And, however much

you might kick at the idea at first, provided this new National Institution was managed efficiently, and asked you to give it shares rather than cash,\* you would, in the end, come quietly to the conclusion that it was your bounden duty to do your best voluntarily to help it.

If, on the other hand, a Liberal were to come to you and say, "Look here 'Bung,' we're going to pass an Act through Parliament to compel you to sacrifice your shares because we Liberals, who are engaged in pushing the interests of Free Importers, want a good election 'cry' against the Brewers!" or, if a Conservative came to you, and said, "Look here 'Belly,' you must let me help you to make sacrifices, because I want a good anti-Grocer 'cry' on behalf of Tariff Reform!" Why then, I take it, you would tell such Liberals and Conservatives—even if they belonged to your own party—to go to the devil: whose methods they were obviously adopting. You would further say that, for your part, you find it difficult to take them seriously, as Social Reformers; that their methods of "doing good" are not cricket! And if they retorted by showing you a list of Bishops and Free Churchmen who favoured such ribbald and Rabelaisian methods of promoting morality, you would hand them a copy of the Prayer Book, and would say, "Take *this* to

---

\* As to the obvious advantage of this procedure, see Chapter VIII.

your Bishops and Free Churchmen, and remind them how, in the ancient Catechism of the one National Institution we have left, a child is still taught that his duty to his neighbour is :

*To love him as myself ; to do to all men as I would that they should do unto me : to keep my hands from picking and stealing, and my tongue from evil speaking, lying, and slandering.*

Nor have I any doubt that, when the large number of Church and Nonconformist dignitaries who (ignorant of our need for a nobler National Institution than the House of Commons) supported the Licensing Bill, have reflected, they will come unquestionably to the conclusion that we have, for all our shortcomings, reached a pitch of civilization when " Bung " and " Belly " methods of promoting morality must be quietly dropped, and more business-like and Christian devices be adopted in their stead.

#### FUNDAMENTAL DIFFERENCE BETWEEN CATHOLIC COLLECTIVISM AND POLITICAL SOCIALISM.

But here I must pause, for a reader will declare : " Yes, yes, yes, but surely this Neo-Catholic—or Lay-controlled—Institution of which you speak—this Corporation within ' the State '—which is to become a moral Landlord, and, when this has proved successful, a moral Shareholder will be essentially a Socialistic Institution ? "

On the contrary, sir, there is the profoundest



difference between the Catholic Collectivism which I am submitting for your consideration, and those political Socialistic devices which may truthfully be described as covetous and untried. And if you are still unable to distinguish Neo-Catholic Collectivism from House of Commons Socialism, may I try to explain more fully the historic connection which exists between proposals for a Neo-Catholic Institution, controlled jointly by Laity and Clergy, and the social and economic achievements of practical corporate Catholicism from 400 to 1400 A.D.

With a view to discovering this connection we must cast a bird's eye view over history, and note the absolutely new phenomenon which appeared in Europe with the establishment—largely by voluntary endowments—of a propertied Christian Church—a “State within the State”—between 400 and 1400 A.D.

First, then, we must remember that, in Greece and Rome, all that we mean by culture and “the humanities,” had only been possible for a small wealthy class who formed the top stratum of Society. There existed in Greece and Rome, indeed, but few equivalents to modern labour-saving machinery which makes for what is, now-a-days, ill-distributed leisure and ill-distributed wealth. On the contrary, most of the dirty work, which will, as time proceeds, be done, more and more, by machinery, was, in agricultural Greece and Rome, done by slaves captured in war. For it was the vast number of their

slaves which gave the Greeks leisure for the arts, athletics, and literature; and which gave the Romans the leisure for conquest and the practice of the art of Colonial Government and Imperial Legislation.

With the advent of the Catholic Church, about 400 A.D., economic conditions remained much the same; and the rank and file of mankind still lived a semi-servile life of bare subsistence on the soil. On all Church lands, however, which covered, in course of time, a third of Western Europe, a new social-economic phenomenon appeared throughout Western Civilization. For the first time in history there was created, in the shape of the monastery, a collective Catholic environment, whose object largely was to preserve all that had been best in the past civilizations of Greece and Rome and Palestine. Within this environment the down-trodden mediæval serf, if willing to accept new duties with new privileges, could—serf though he had been—secure leisure for acquiring much—I do not say all—that had been best in the civilizations of Greece, Rome and Palestine. For at Glastonbury, Tintern, Melrose, or any of the three thousand monastic Institutions which covered these ancient Isles in the Middle Ages, he could secure the leisure, the tools and the training, which enabled him to commune with the poets and prophets of Palestine, to reproduce, on a more aspiring scale, the architecture of Greece and Byzantium, and to codify and and apply, throughout Church lands, the legal system of the

Romans, which still, in so many particulars, forms the basis of the jurisprudence of modern Society. As against this, however, it must be remembered, the collective monastery necessitated an unnatural abstinence from matrimony.

PRIMITIVE COLLECTIVISM, OR THE ECONOMIC ORIGIN OF MONASTICISM.

It is, I know, commonly asserted that, in the early Middle Ages, such millions of our ancestors entered Monasteries and Nunneries because they desired spiritual solitude and contemplation. But, while, as Mr. Kidd has so lucidly pointed out, a violent form of asceticism was necessary to impress upon mankind that altruism without which there could be no moral progress—while this is so, I say—a dispassionate consideration of economic as well as theological causes is obviously necessary to a true understanding of such a prolonged phenomenon as mediæval Monasticism.

When, therefore, you see—throughout Western Civilization—millions of men and women\*—the poorest of the poor in so many instances—entering upon monastic life in which, by abstinence from matrimony, and obedience to Church discipline, they could secure the advantage of a “civilized” life, you are aware, as you gaze over history, that a totally new phenomenon is before you, and that, for

---

\* For all that, in *early ages*, Monasticism did for women the reader is referred to “*Women under Monasticism*,” by Linan Eckenstein (Cambridge University Press).

the first time in history, in a barbarous and bloody age, humanity had made such progress that the Church could create, in the form of the Monastery, a social-economic environment—unscientific though it unquestionably was—for giving to the poorest of the poor that leisure which was necessary for culture.

Despite the glories of Tintern and Melrose, and the vast numbers of the streets in our old county towns which bear Monastic names, few persons recognise the immense “humanizing” as well as ascetic, influence of the Monastery upon our mediæval ancestors. “I am sure,” wrote Lord Beaconsfield in his historical novel, *Sybil*, “that not the faintest idea is generally prevalent of the appearance of England before and since the Dissolution. Why, in England and Wales alone, there were of these institutions of different sizes, I mean monasteries, and chantries and chapels and great ‘hospitals’ considerably upwards of three thousand; all of them fair buildings, many of them of exquisite beauty. There were on an average in every shire at least twenty structures: establishments that were as vast and as magnificent and as beautiful as your Belvoirs and your Chatsworths, your Wentworths and your Stowes. Try to imagine the effect of thirty or forty Chatsworths in this country, the proprietors of which were never absent. You complain enough now of absentees. The monks were never non-resident. They expended their revenue among those whose labour had produced it. These holy men,



too, built and planted, as they did everything, for posterity: their churches were cathedrals; their schools colleges; their halls and libraries the muniment rooms of kingdoms; their woods and waters, their farms and gardens, were laid out and disposed on a scale and in a spirit that are now extinct; they made the country beautiful, and the people proud of their country."

#### WHY THE MONASTERIES DECLINED.

While, however, the early Church created, in the form of the Monastery, a valuable though unscientific environment, which was of admirable service to contemporary Humanity down to 1400, such a vast improvement began, henceforth, to take place in social and economic conditions, that Monasticism became less and less necessary. And if, at the Reformation, the Church had been able to distinguish between the spiritual and moral, she would, as Lord Beaconsfield was on the verge of recognising, have transformed Monkish property into a Lay-controlled wealth-owning Church. The result would have been that modern labour-saving Machinery would have entered Britain, under corporate Neo-Catholic auspices, calculated to enable working men (who, wishing to possess the leisure for culture, would, in the Middle Ages, have had to become Monks)—to marry, and still—thanks to modern labour-saving machinery—possess opportunities for culture, and to live in streets architecturally as beautiful as Tintern.



CATHOLIC COLLECTIVISM DISCIPLINED DEMOCRACY AS  
POLITICAL SOCIALISM DOES NOT.

At the same time—and the point is of immense importance—this would have only been done on lines which necessitated the continuance of a modernized form of discipline, akin to that imposed by the mediæval Church. For it was the unique triumph of Collective Catholicism that it disciplined the democratic Monk; the mediæval system of penance, fines, hair-shirts, etc., being as good for the half-animal “Man in the Street,” in the Middle Ages, as something mildly akin to it would be obviously beneficial to many a “Man in the Street” to-day!

Now, it is here that “State” Socialism breaks down, and breaks down utterly. Its object—an object with which all “humane” minds must, at any rate, sympathise—is to secure to the modern working man greater leisure than he now possesses, for culture, and more money for the moral and technical education of his children, and for the beautifying and enlarging of his home. Practically all working men who are socialists of the kind one can respect are keen about Socialism precisely for this reason, that they crave for more beauty in their own lives and the lives of their children, and are conscious of deserving something better than to be toiling at what is, often, some merely mechanical occupation for an abnormal number of hours, year after year. What such men resent and resent bitterly is that the lives of such a large proportion of their

fellows, and especially their women-folk, should be spent in a commercially needless, and morally degrading, struggle against unnatural conditions.

#### WEAKNESS OF POLITICAL SOCIALISM.

What such men, in their very natural desire to secure, for their fellows and themselves, a somewhat larger margin of leisure fail, in too many instances, to recognise, is that the community can only secure the modern worker larger leisure, and, in many instances, a just proportion of the product of his toil, provided the modern worker will voluntarily consent to submit to a modernized form of mediæval discipline. That discipline need not, to-day, take the form of an unnatural abstinence from marriage. Machinery, which produces the necessities of life with such amazing rapidity, came to stop the necessity for such abnormal celibacy as earlier conditions necessitated. But that discipline must inevitably take a form whereby the benefits of fairer wages, somewhat lower rents, and, in certain instances, larger leisure, will be attainable only by those working men who are prepared, in return for these concessions to be, with their families, self-supporting units, to pay, that is to say, a small direct contribution towards the education of their children and to set aside, out of their own pockets, sums to ensure comfort in their old age, etc.

In other words, the only system under which a juster distribution of wealth can possibly take place

must be a system which disciplines and dutifies Democracy.

The modern working man says that he wishes the Community to be an Owner, or Part-owner, of the machinery of modern life, so as to secure to him a fair living wage, and a just share of that leisure of which the wealthy Shareholder has now often too much. In a word, the modern working man wants to be a bit of a gentleman. Well, that is an aspiration which all who value human progress must share. What the working man surely forgets is, that if he wishes to be a bit of a gentleman, he must gradually accept the responsibilities of a gentleman's position, as well as its privileges. He must recognise that is to say—that, in proportion as his wages increase, and his rent and the cost of his house decrease, it can only be on the stern condition that he pays directly out of his own pocket, in proportion to his means (as gentlemen do to-day) for the education of his children, for the maintenance of himself in old age ; and also pays direct contributions towards the upkeep of those hospitals, libraries, etc., which are now supported by voluntary contributions of gentlemen who are really gentlemen.

#### JUSTNESS OF CATHOLIC COLLECTIVISM.

If the more intelligent of those who toil with their hands are prepared gradually to discipline themselves, rather than merely expect the rich to do this, then there is no reason why a Neo-Catholic Institu-

tion should not be established, which shall, as time goes on, co-ordinate the bulk of the voluntary gifts to the community now largely wasted on charities, and become the recipient of voluntarily bequeathed house-property, shares, land, etc., which are now owned by many wealthy persons, who have far more wealth than they want for personal use. For such persons would part with a portion of it—as gladly as our Norman Nobility did when they endowed the mediæval Church—provided that, in so doing, they were bequeathing it to a Neo-Catholic Institution, which they could respect because its object would be to “humanize” rather than pauperize.

Just as, in early days, I submit, the peasant who wished to rise above a life of merely manual toil, to work but a few hours daily in the monastic gardens, to use the monastic library, to study literature, or to act in Church Plays, could only obtain these advantages if he obeyed the disciplinary regulations of the Monastery: so too, to-day—despite the fact that modern machinery does so much to save labour—and produce the means of living, rapidly—no system whereby houses and shares shall, in course of time, be owned by a Neo-Catholic Institution, can ever secure to every citizen all the advantages, literary, artistic and architectural, of the beautiful old Monasteries—and *in addition allow him to marry*—unless his home life is watched over, in a commonsense manner, by a Neo-Catholic Institution, which owns his house, which, in course of time, has possibly an



interest in the concern which employs him, and which, directly it discovers that he "boozes" away his money in drink, or starves his wife and children, raises his rent, and may, in the last resort, be empowered by the State to intercept, on pay-day, a portion of his wages, to feed his children : *i.e.* guarantees that he and his family form a self-supporting unit.

#### SUMMARY OF THE CASE FOR CATHOLIC COLLECTIVISM.

To sum up—The experience of our ancestors in the Collective Middle Ages, tells us, with unmistakable clearness, that our obvious need is not destructive State Socialism, controlled by the "Man in the Street," but a constructive Catholicism, controlled by a new Order of Churchmen and Social Wardens, whom both Plutocracy and Democracy can respect. For, on the one hand, it will discipline the plutocratic "Bounder" by teaching him to endow the Church, as our old Norman Nobility used to do in the Middle Ages, and, on the other hand, it will discipline the democratic "Bounder," and not, as our present political parties seem compelled to do, pander to the ignorance or self-interest of both.

If—that is to say—present social evils demand that the community should become—on a larger scale than at present—an owner of land and capital, such land and capital must not be acquired as the result of mandates given to "the State" by the "Man in the Street." For, at election times, he is



not a cool, responsible citizen, but becomes, temporarily, under the hypnotic influence of crowded mass meetings, an unbalanced and emotional medium—the mere tool of the Professional Agitator. On the contrary, such land and capital as is required, must be acquired by the moral suasion of a Church whose policy appeals to the conscience and intelligence of all responsible citizens in their calmest moments.

The policy of such a Church will be threefold—

(a) To become a disciplinary Landlord.

(b) To become a Shareholder, but not a Manager, in Industry.

(c) To finance National Education.

As regards her constitution, she will, I submit, be controlled, partly by existing Members of the Clergy, and a select number of Members of the House of Lords, but in the main by Laymen elected by the Altruists of the Nation, by all Social Workers, and by all who are prepared voluntarily to endow her with gifts of houses, land or shares—and by the heirs of the latter to the second generation.

Finally, may I submit that the most obvious advantages of this course is, that if such a Neo-Catholic Church makes any rash experiments, there will still be “the State” to stop her. If, as it seems likely to do, “the State” makes rash attempts to solve the question of a juster distribution of wealth by appeals to the passions of crowded electoral meeting, we shall find ourselves between the Scylla of a Social Revolution and the Charybdis of a Napoleonic Dictator.

## CHAPTER V.

## THE "DARK AGES" OF MACHINERY:

OR

1760-1910.

"Mammon led them on  
Mammon, the least erected spirit  
That fell from heaven."—*Milton*.

The reader who has carefully studied the preceding chapters must, by this time, be aware that a study of the economic aspects of history from the earliest ages, is to-day throwing a totally new light upon the present condition of our own and other countries

To some, indeed, it is a chilly affair to study the economic mechanism of history; to recognise that economic conditions as well as spiritual idealism created the Monastery; to discover that a sordid greed for gold ran side by side with patriotism in the career of Marlborough, or that his heavy personal debts played their part in those mixed motives which prompted Julius Cæsar to overthrow the Republic, and establish his personal supremacy, throughout the Empire.

To the young and enthusiastic, I say, considerations such as these come like cold water, which damps the ardour of youthful enthusiasm. Nevertheless, it is surely as well that the economic aspects of history should be studied. An acquaintance with the brutal bread-and-butter facts in the "green-room" of Humanity's Theatre is, indeed vital to a sympathetic grip of every aspect of the human Drama. And it is to this end that we approach what is, from many points of view, the secret history of Britain for the last century-and-a-half.

#### THE COMING OF RAPID WEALTH-CREATING MACHINERY.

Now, in ordinary history-books you will find comparatively little stress laid on the fact that the Epoch 1760 to 1910 has been the Machine Age. You will find rather that, during this period, your attention is mainly directed by our historians towards the further development of that representative principle, which had begun with the dramatic triumph of the House of Commons under Cromwell in 1649. You will find—in such story-books—that, second in importance, comes the Revolution of 1688, which fully determined the limited character of our Monarchy, and the muddle-through character of our quasi-Republican Executive: while, compared with these two political revolutions, the rest of our history, so such story-books tell you, sinks into a comparative gloom, which is only lit up by the capture of Canada from the French, the camp-fires and cannon flashes of Waterloo and Trafalgar; and that

comparatively recent spreading of the English-speaking races over America, Australia, and South Africa, which has resulted in the establishment of a "free," transitional, and anti-Catholic, form of "Government"—or, to be more accurate, "Guidance"—over half the globe.

It is, then, with no desire to belittle the achievements of the House of Commons in the direction of civil and religious liberty, that I ask the reader to remember that the Industrial Revolution of 1760, which inaugurated the coming of Modern Machinery, was a Revolution not less momentous in our history than was the foundation of our individualistic liberties in 1647 and 1688. For it was the Industrial Revolution of 1760 which transformed us, so largely, from an agricultural into a street-bred people; with vast results, for both good and ill, upon our physique, and upon our social and economic destiny.

THE COMING OF MACHINERY, UNDER PROTESTANT AND  
INDIVIDUAL AUSPICES, HAS HAD A "TEMPORARILY"  
UNCIVILIZING EFFECT.

It follows that, when judged from an economic, moral, and social point of view, the oft-heard assertion that the Epoch 1760 to 1910, has been the most "civilized" epoch in History, must be sternly qualified to-day by a recognition that the "greatness" of this Epoch lies in the realm of mechanics, individual intellectuality, and Freedom.

Far from being an Epoch of moral, social, architectural or artistic advance, the Epoch 1760 to 1910, will, indeed, some day be recognised as a singularly crude age when a vast increase in the methods of producing wealth led to a vast increase in our population (from eight millions to forty-five), under conditions so physically reactionary, so socially unscientific, and so architecturally obscene, that the confusion created by the coming of new wealth-getting machinery into our Protestant Constitution, can only accurately be compared to the confusion created, in the "dark Ages," (500 to 1000 A.D.) when the coming of the Barbarians shattered the orderly legislative Constitution of ancient Rome.

And just as, when the Roman Constitution was shattered, European Society was only saved from chaos and dissolution by a practical propertied disciplinary Catholic Church, which, amid the fertile confusion which ensued, preserved for posterity all that had been best in the civilizations of Greece and Rome, and added something new thereto; so too, to-day, Society in the West will only be saved from social and moral anarchy by the triumph of a Neo-Catholic Institution—*i.e.* a practical propertied Church, controlled by Laymen as well as Priests—which shall create order out of our fertile chaos, by "humanizing" both Democracy and Plutocracy, and by preserving for our children all that has been best in the Grecian, the Roman, the Catholic-Feudal, the Free and the Machine Civilizations of the past.



## WHAT, THEN, HAPPENED IN 1760?

The year 1760, which initiated the Machine Age, is, indeed, an *annus mirabilis* in the history of our race. Previous to this date, it must be remembered, the most populous and prosperous regions in Britain were the now comparatively unimportant counties of Somerset, Gloucestershire and Wiltshire; where a system of manufacturing cloth by means of cottage hand-loom represented the chief form of manufacture in Britain. Previous to this date, the rest of Britain, with the exception of London, was but sparsely inhabited. Though Sheffield had long been famous for its cutlery, Yorkshire was better known as an agricultural than a manufacturing county. Lancashire was better known for the part that one of its Dukes had played in the Wars of the Roses, than for its cotton; while Worcestershire and Staffordshire were associated in the minds of our countrymen, with the ancient Abbeys of Evesham and Tewkesbury, rather than with "Worcestershire Sauce," and the machine-made cities of Birmingham and Wolverhampton.

Similarly—to cast a bird's eye view over London—Paddington was, in 1760, not known as the Metropolitan Headquarters of the Great Western Railway but because, amid its green fields, stood the Manor House of Paddington, which had been the country seat of Viscount Bolingbroke—that brilliant, though dissipated, "Church and King" Tory. Tottenham was not the tawdry rendez-vous of revolutionary

anarchists, but the abode of the *Bell of Edmonton*, from whose rustic balcony the wife of John Gilpin would, ere long, espy

“ Her loving husband, wondering much,  
To see how he did ride ” !

Charing Cross was not known for its suburban train service, but rather because Edward I. had there set up the last of the Crosses to his beloved Queen Eleanor. While the Euston Road was rather famed—not for the smoke and din of Euston and St. Pancras Railway Stations—but as the scene of one of the most exquisite of mediæval legends, which tells how :—

“ Lady Nancy was laid in St. Pancras Church,  
Lord Lovel was laid in the choir ;  
And out of her bosom there grew a red rose,  
And out of her lover's a brier.

“ They grew and they grew, to the Church steeple, too,  
And then they could grow no higher.  
So there they entwined in a true lover's knot,  
For all lovers true to admire.”

In other words, it was amid a quasi-rustic community, with agricultural customs and a Protestant Constitution, that a quasi-barbaric invasion of modern machinery—steam, canals, railways, telegraphs, etc.—occurred, which has transformed us, in the brief course of a century and a half, from an agricultural into a street-bred people. Let us briefly examine this change.

## THE COMING, IN 1760, OF PORTABLE CAPITAL.

In the first place, as the reader will remember, the discovery of gold and silver mines in Spanish South America, in the 15th century, had, by 1760, lent a totally new aspect to industry and commerce. It had, at last, created that essential to National—as opposed to merely local—commerce, viz., a portable currency in the form of gold and silver coins. For coin had hitherto been very scarce, and trade, in consequence, almost entirely local in character.

The result was that, by 1760, a vast amount of such coin was in circulation. In those days, however, and for many years to come, facilities for safe investment were well-nigh unknown to the majority of our ancestors, and so great was the difficulty and danger of investing capital that the practice of “hoarding” was a common one. We are told, for instance, by Macaulay, that the father of the poet Pope, though an inhabitant of the City of London, and a substantial business man, had such indifferent facilities for investing money (save in the direct form of a business controlled by himself) that, when he retired from business in London, he carried to his house in the country, a strong box containing nearly £20,000 in coin, and took out from time to time what was required for household expenses.

In other words, somewhere about 1760, there existed, in all parts of the country, vast hoardings of new gold and silver coin, which could be at the disposal of any new and safe form of enterprise which required to be capitalized.

THE COMING, IN 1760, OF IMPROVED "MACHINERY"  
FOR TRANSIT.

In the second place, about this year, the first of two such forms of new enterprises, requiring portable capital, arose, in the form of the first canal in this country, which was built by the Duke of Bridgwater, in the region of Manchester: a method of transit which resulted, ultimately, in covering Britain with those canals which were the precursors of the Modern Railway; and which were dug—by the way—by the individual spade-labour of a vast body of agricultural labourers (displaced by the application of capital and machinery to agriculture) who were known, when engaged upon their watery toil, as "inland-navigators": a title which has, in recent years, degenerated into the slang term "navvy."

THE COMING IN 1760 OF STEAM AND MECHANICAL  
LABOUR-SAVING MACHINERY.

The third, and perhaps the most important, event associated with the new "Machine Age" was the coming of steam, and of mechanical inventions for the saving of labour. I need scarcely remind the reader that it was in 1769 (the year in which Napoleon and Wellington were born) that James Watt took out his patent for the Steam Engine, which sixteen years later was applied to the cotton manufacture. It was about the same time—in 1769—that the first efficient roller spinning frame was



invented. In 1779 Crompton invented the spinning mule, while, ere the close of the century, the iron industry in the Midlands was revolutionized by the invention of smelting by pit-coal, and by the application of the steam-engine to blast furnaces.

Now, I do not propose to deal at greater length with the coming of machinery, which the reader can study for himself in Arnold Toynbee's *Industrial Revolution*, or in the earlier pages of Mr. Shadwell's *Industrial Efficiency*. With a view, however, to linking this chapter with the last, I must note Mr. Shadwell's observation in the latter volume, in which he says: "There is a great temptation to linger on this singular period, and to speculate on the causes of the inventive genius by which it was marked above all others."

Now, in the light of what we have seen, it is by no means difficult to discover the two chief causes which, about 1760, stimulated our ancestors to invent labour-saving machinery. In the first place, it must be remembered that the vast majority of these mechanical inventions were the work of clever but illiterate working-men, possessing the creative faculty. Now, men of this type of mind, distasteful of merely manual toil and ambitious of leisure, would, all of them, previous to the year 1550, have entered—as we have seen—the labour-saving\* Monasteries, where they would have found that leisure and that

---

\* See Chapter IV.



outlet for ambition for which such men yearn. As long, therefore, as the Monasteries existed to provide such types of mind with the leisure which they wanted, so long would the stimulus necessary to goad them into creating labour-saving machinery be wanting.

Why, then, it will be asked, did this type of mind not direct its attention towards labour-saving machinery immediately after the destruction of the Monasteries? The answer is surely to be found in the fact that, from 1500 down to 1760, all such minds were bent, almost exclusively, in pondering over the theological problems awakened by the Reformation.

And now may I endeavour to outline the advance, under anti-Catholic auspices, of what we may perhaps call those unbaptized Barbarians, "Machinery and Capital," from 1760 to 1910. My sketch will be brief, and I shall take the same sub-divisions as before.

#### VAST DEVELOPMENT, FROM 1760 TO 1910, OF PORTABLE CAPITAL.

Of the development of portable Capital between 1760 and the present time, it is scarcely necessary to speak. One must, however, briefly note:—

(a) A vast development of the Banking System, including bank-notes—whereby vast sums are lent for Commerce, to Companies and individuals, with-

out any Catholic and corporate stipulations as to how such monies will be used.

(b) A vast development of stock-broking, bill-discounting, and under-writing on similar terms.

(c) A vast development of the quite modern system under which rents (which used to be spent by the Monks and the best of our landed Proprietors, among their tenantry) have become commercialized, with the result that the rent a Briton has to pay for his home, or his farm is, now-a-days, settled by competition in the land market, and bears no just relation to the size of his weekly or quarterly income, or the corporate needs of the community.

(d) A vast increase in foreign investments, which, at present, amount to between three and four thousand million pounds sterling.\*

VAST DEVELOPMENT, BETWEEN 1760 AND 1910, OF  
THE MEANS OF TRANSIT.

Writing in an age when electricity is only beginning to be applied to methods of transit, and when, above all things, we are on the eve of learning to fly, any observation on our advance in regard to methods of transit must be hopelessly inadequate. Suffice it, then, to note that the invention, by Macadam, of the system of crushing stones for making roads (instead of throwing down boulders)

---

\* See Article on Foreign Investments in the *Quarterly Review* for July, 1907.

which, in 1815, vastly improved our mail-coach service, and our system of travelling by post-chaise : while in 1817, the "Savannah," the first efficient steamboat, sailed from New York to Liverpool ; and in 1830 the first railroad was opened.

Since those notable dates—both less than a century ago—our trade-routes have, as everyone knows, become dotted thickly with a rapidly increasing host of steamboats, and our land with railway rolling stock ; methods of transit which will unquestionably be superseded by other mechanic developments.

#### VAST DEVELOPMENT IN MECHANICAL LABOUR- SAVING MACHINERY BETWEEN 1760 AND 1910.

Mechanical inventions, between 1760 and 1910, have been so numerous that it is impossible, and perhaps needless, to enumerate them. The main point which I would venture to make in connection with them is one which applies, with no less force, to our improved methods of transit, and to our increase in portable capital. It is — as I have tried to shew—that they have entered the British Constitution under Individualistic and anti-Church auspices. Every new mechanical invention, that is to say, is protected by an individualistic patent, which gives a single individual or Firm, exclusive right to enjoy the wealth and leisure which such a patent creates. For these exclusive rights require, to-day, to be counter-balanced by an equally

strong sense of the exclusive responsibilities which attach to those benefitted by new inventions, and by the establishing of an efficient National Institution to which superfluous profits, derived from such sources, can be voluntarily bequeathed, as a point of honour, and not at the point of the party bayonet.

#### SUMMARY.

This brings us, once more, back to the point which was made in Chapter III. on Protestant Individualism. We are, indeed, now in a position to see more clearly than in that chapter, that, from the Reformation down to 1760, Protestant Individualism was a noble movement for freeing us from Priests who tyrannized over men's minds, and Kings, or Star Chambers, who tyrannized over their bodies. On the other hand, we now see clearly that Protestant Individualism, while admirable from the point of view of religious and civil liberty, comes out badly in regard to the moral aspects of commerce; and, while admirable down to 1760, was not suited for the commercial era which then opened. What was required, about 1760, and is still wanted—was a Neo-Catholic Institution, blending the moral and social advantages of pre-Reformation Catholicism with the advantages of Protestantism, and using its wealth to moralize housing, trade and the tenure of land.

It has—may I once more repeat—been our misfortune that, from 1760 to 1910, we have been unable

to distinguish the spiritual and intellectual limitations of pre-Reformation Catholicism from its social moral, and collective advantages. The result is that modern machinery has arisen under Protestant, and Individualistic, rather than Catholic and corporate, auspices. In other words, a vast improvement in devices for producing wealth has taken place, under the auspices—not of a Church strong enough financially, and socially, to moralize the introduction of machinery and its accompanying “fortunes”—but under the auspices of one whom Milton described as

“Mammon who led them on,  
Mammon, the least erected spirit that fell  
From heaven.”

Is it, then, so unfair to describe the entry of those unbaptized Barbarians—machinery—railways—and modern methods of money-making—into our anti-Catholic Constitution to the entry of Goths and Huns into the Roman Constitution? Is it unfair to say that, just as the Goths had to be civilized and humanized by the Church, so, too, these new machine forces have now to be “catholicized” and made the Servants of Humanity?

Alas! it is, in many instances, only too necessary. For, if Britain were really a civilized country (as Civilization will, ere long, be understood) every child born here would receive all the benefits of the Grecian, Roman, Mediæval, Free, and Machine Civilizations which have preceded us. Instead of



being—as too many are—allowed to live the semi-barbarous life of a “Street-Arab,” these little mortals would be born in a street whose architecture recalled, as Bourneville faintly does, the glories of Tintern. They would receive in youth a needful amount of military discipline, which would imbue them with the advantages of the military civilizations of Sparta and Rome. Thanks to modern labour-saving machinery they would, when they came to manhood and womanhood, have enough leisure for as much intellectual or artistic development as they were capable of. While, thanks to a Church, which owned, as we shall shortly see—in many instances—their homes, they would be taught to use leisure wisely: and, without any attempt being made to tyrannize over their minds, they would be taught to believe reverently in God, as their Spiritual Father, to love their neighbours as themselves, and to make the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ—physically—intellectually—morally—and spiritually—their goal.

This was what Burke implied when—writing in 1769, in the early years of the Industrial Revolution—he made the noble Catholic declaration :

“If wealth is the obedient and laborious slave of virtue and of public honour, then wealth is in its place, and has its use: but if this order is changed and honour is to be sacrificed to the conservation of riches, riches, which have neither eyes nor hands, nor anything truly vital in them, cannot long survive

the being of their vivifying powers, their legitimate masters, and their potent protectors. If we command our wealth, we shall be rich and free: if our wealth commands us, we are poor indeed."<sup>(a)</sup>

Instead, alas! of following Burke's Catholic advice, the ideal of too many a Briton, since the coming of machinery, has been merely to consider two aspects of truth, viz., Protestant Liberty, and the advantages of the individual possession of machinery for saving labour, and creating personal wealth rapidly. The result has been an inglorious anti-Church struggle, on the part of too many of us, to grab as much machinery, capital, or shares, in this vast network of machinery as we can, each for himself, forgetful of the fact that the Civilization of the future must inevitably be one wherein all citizens mutually endeavour, under the guidance of the Spirit of Truth, to create for each child a Neo-Catholic environment which will give it all that has been best in the civilizations of the past.

---

(a) Present State of the Nation.

## CHAPTER VI.

## WEALTH AND THE COMMONWEALTH:

OR

## COLLECTIVISM AND INDIVIDUALISM.

(A Neo-Catholic Via-media.)

“Throughout the whole of our history we observe, that the leading men who have guided the fortunes of our commonwealth, in times of great difficulty and danger, have invariably agreed in one line of policy, namely, to eschew abstractions. This resolution is the distinguishing feature of English statesmanship; it is the principal cause of the duration of the English state; and herein eminently consists the ‘wisdom of our ancestors.’”—

BEACONSFIELD,

(Vindication of the English Constitution).

The conclusions with which our last chapter ended bring us straight on to that debatable point, around which, at the present time, the fiercest controversy rages, between Individualists and Collectivists, as to who ought to be the owner of Modern Capital, of modern methods of Transit, and of modern labour-saving Machinery; all of which are quite new and have, as we have seen, entered Britain since 1760, under Individualistic and Protestant, rather than Catholic and Collective, auspices.

In endeavouring to find a common-sense answer to this thorny question, may I ask the reader to throw aside, for the moment, any existing prejudices he may have (in favour of Individualism or Collectivism), and critically to examine the contention that the truth about this great question is, that neither Collectivists or Individualists are wholly in the right; but that the truth lies mid-way between them. The obvious result being that a common-sense people will be wise if they refuse to see only one side of a complicated question, but recognise that both Individualism and Collectivism have much to be said for them.

## I.

### THE CASE FOR COLLECTIVISM.

First, then, may I attempt to put the case for Collectivism as lucidly as I can. To this end it will be necessary to shew that all modern "fortunes" made (still more, all fortunes inherited) during the Machine Age—*i.e.*, since 1760—are due far more largely to the forces of Civilization, than to the individuals who are often described as having "made" them.

The bedrock proposition submitted is one which all business men will recognise as true. It is that progress is, to-day, inherent in Capital, in improved methods of transit, and in machinery generally, rather than in labour.

COMMERCIAL PROGRESS TO-DAY INHERENT IN CAPITAL  
RATHER THAN IN LABOUR.

"The labourer of to-day," as a shrewd observer has written, "does not and cannot, perform more, by his own unaided labour, than the workman of a hundred years ago. The same amount of exertion which exhausted his ancestor, exhausts him, the weight which the ordinary man of former days could not lift will prove too heavy for the man of this day. We cannot afford to spend more muscular or brain power in one day, or one year, than our forefathers could. If now by one turn of a handle we effect and produce more than could be effected in old times by many minutes' work, if by working a screw we can lift with slight exertion a weight which our predecessors would have had to divide into ten lots, if in one hour we cover by railway the extent of a whole day's foot travel, the growth of power is evidently not in ourselves, in labour, but in the instrument which we use, in capital. *Whoever owns and commands the instrument, owns and commands the increase in power.*"

Now, before proceeding further I would suggest that what the writer of the above passage called "machinery" must be given a wider connotation. It must not be confined merely to machinery in the iron and steel sense of the word, but to those phenomena which are associated with it.

For, among the numerous instances in which the



Owners, or Share-owners, of machinery are enabled to reap what has been often—morally—an undue share of profits, not the least important are the instances of those who, as working owners, or irresponsible Share-owners, possess, not some iron machine, such as a town spinning-machine, or an agricultural gleaner, but rather a machine-like Organization, such as a Mail Order business, an Advertising business, a block of House Property in a populous town, or, indeed, any business Organization which relies upon the machinery of Modern so-called Civilization, which has arisen since 1760, (see last chapter).

With few exceptions, the Owners, or Share-owners, of such Organizations, or—if one might coin a new phrase—"Business Machines," reap a considerable profit, in many instances, for doing nothing, while the real work is done by the Manager and the wage-earners, or by those who look after the "Business Machine," whether that Machine is an A B C Shop, a Mail Order Business, an actual Iron Machine—such as a cloth loom—or a row of houses.

Now, wherever a Trades Union of a powerful kind exists wage-earners reap, as a rule, in the form of larger wages, a proportion of what are in a sense the "profits." The reader will perhaps agree that that is a fair way of putting it, because, as a matter of fact, in such instances, the Owners of Business Machines get less than if they had bargained with workers in an absolutely open market.

It is, therefore, unjust to make such a silly generalization as that all Capitalists "sweat" their employees, etc. The whole question is, as Political Socialists do not quite understand, essentially a moral one, which can only be dealt with on moral Neo-Catholic lines.

HOW MODERN FORTUNES ARE DUE TO THE MACHINERY  
OF MODERN LIFE.

To show, more fully, how largely modern fortunes are due to the Machinery of modern life, let us take the case of a Mail Order Business, and note how far a man is entitled—I do not say legally—but morally, to all the profits which he sometimes receives, and which he bequeaths to his descendents in the form of shares, which have no moral responsibilities attaching to them. For, when we examine into the facts we shall discover that neither such an one—still less his descendents—are morally entitled to as much as they often receive: and we shall see that, if Society chose, it could quickly teach him the precise extent to which his fortune really depends upon his own toil. The truth indeed is, that the Owner, or Share-owner, of such a thing, for example, as a large *Mail Order Business* has well-nigh *gratis* command over four sets of social Machinery, which Society allows him to use without receiving from him—in many instances—a fair *quid pro quo*.

In the first place, Society presents him with a social Machine, in the form of the Post Office

whereby, for a trifling sum, he can distribute his price-lists, and send his messages over a vast area for an insignificant figure. But he did not create either the Post Office or the Telegraph! Nor could he, *without the co-operation of his fellows*, send letters and messages thousands of miles for the amazingly cheap sums varying from a half-penny to a few shillings. *But for the co-operation of his fellows* he would have to pay from, say, half-a-crown to £50, for sending letters and messages all over the world.

In the second place, social machinery, in the form of the Printing Press, also enables him, for a comparatively small sum, to print his catalogues. But he did not create the Printing Press: Nor could he, *without the co-operation of his fellows*, keep the cost of printing as low as it is.

In the third place, the Railways form a social Machine *whose fares are kept low through the co-operation of his fellows*, assure him rapid transit for his travellers and his goods; while the labour involved in directing envelopes, in sending stereotyped answers, in packing goods, and in keeping accounts, is remunerated at a rate which makes it quite clear that progress is inherent in those who own the Business Machine rather than in the labour which works it.

Fourth, when the owner goes to that social machine—his Bank, and obtains a large over-draft, he is really

borrowing from a number of his fellow-citizens who have placed their small deposits in the aforesaid Bank. He is, in consequence, under a deep moral obligation to them: an obligation which (if he is a sportsman) he ought frankly to recognise, as we shall see, should good fortune attend his business efforts, by liberally endowing a Neo-Catholic Institution, for social ends.

Lastly, the Owners of this Mail Order Business are profoundly indebted to density of population for the wealth they acquire. For they did not create the population, and they have slight, if any, moral "right" to export, for instance, the wealth reaped from our home population, in the form of investments abroad, until they are quite certain that everyone is properly housed and properly fed in the land where they were born, where they were educated, and, by the aforesaid co-operation of their fellows, acquired "their" wealth.

Now, in submitting that the Owner or Shareowner of a Mail Order Business, who utilizes, at such cheap rates, the forces of Civilization, possesses the well-nigh *gratis* use of four sets of machinery, I was attempting to be as lucid as possible, and did not wish to confuse the mind of the reader by asking him to consider too many phenomena at once. But it would really be more accurate to say that a Mail Order Business—like all modern businesses since 1760—represents (just as this volume does) a partnership, not merely between its Owners and Society, in the form of the Post Office, and the Printing



Press, the Banks, and the Railways, but a partnership with Humanity at large, living and dead.

In a word, every successful business man, or as is equally true, every successful Author, is (in business phraseology) a partner with Humanity and Co. Unlimited.

This is a startling and awful thought, but reflection will show that it is true. For all Humanity have co-operated in the past, and co-operate to-day, in creating and maintaining not merely Post Offices, Printing Presses, Railways and Banks, but also Steamboats, Canals, Telephones, Libraries, the Police Forces who maintain order, and those amazingly cheap Newspapers, wherein the prices of agricultural stock, or industrial raw material, or of the money market, the prospects of war and peace, etc.—all so valuable to the Merchant and the Financier—are reported for a merely nominal sum.

If, in addition to this, one remembers that a third of the land over which our Railways run, and our factories are built, once belonged to a Collective Church, which owned a third of the land, laid the foundations of Western Civilization, and made the settled conditions, under which Western wealth is secured, possible, it becomes clear how much every Capitalist owes to the moral principle as exhibited throughout all Western Nations, in the form of corporate Catholicism down to the Reformation. It becomes, in consequence, clear that it is his bounden duty to pay back his indebtedness to our ancestral Dead, and to those Christian principles which made the



creation and security of modern wealth-getting machinery possible. For, upon the graves of the Dead, and the property of the Church, he is trafficking, if, owning wealth due to their past achievements, he does not fully recognise their claims. And it is to give him an opportunity of doing this that the claims of Humanity and Co. require to be embodied in a practical propertied Catholic Institution, which shall fulfil the social and moral functions of Mediæval Catholicism, without its spiritual intolerance—it being merely to get rid of the spiritual intolerance of Southern Priests, that the Collective endowments of the Church were temporarily abandoned at the Reformation.

Let us fail to do this, and, sooner or later, we shall unquestionably find—if we have not done so already—that we have kicked from under our feet the moral mediæval ladder whereby those Western peoples, to whom we belong, have created a settled Civilization. Let us fail to do this, and we shall assuredly find that our country has reverted to something approaching pre-mediæval—*i.e.* pre-Christian—barbarism. For, by our unwillingness to endow a Neo-Catholic Institution, which shall give all classes the benefits of what has been best in previous Civilizations, we shall have unconsciously allowed our children—the Fathers and Mothers of the future—to grow up into Goths and Huns—or “Street-Arabs,” as we call them—who will, directly or indirectly, be the downfall of our Empire.

## II.

## THE CASE FOR INDIVIDUALISM.

From what the reader has hitherto read, he will, perhaps, conclude that the writer is one who believes that Humanity & Co. ought, under ideal conditions, to own all the capital, all the land, and all the means of production, and that the writer merely differs from Political Socialists in submitting that the community ought to be organized, for this end, through a Neo-Catholic Institution, which will eventually acquire all these as a result of voluntary Neo-Catholic bequests, and the spread of a sense of right, rather than of appeals to the political passions of the electorate through the House of Commons.

This, at any rate, is the ideal which the Socialist who takes up this volume will at once picture to himself. But surely no man in his senses believes that the altruistic principle can, or ought, to develop to such an extent as that. For, while a wise man will have every respect for what is known as the "community," and while he may have seen many instances whereby a large number of our fellows have acted in co-operation, and collectively controlled some simple commercial undertaking, has anyone ever heard, or read, of any commercial undertaking—and particularly any new and untried undertaking—depending for its success upon some new scientific discovery, or upon the organization of the undertaking itself, in which success has not been

very largely due to the courage, the intelligence, and the sheer genius, of a solitary individual master-mind, who utilizes skilfully, and improves upon, the past achievements, moral and physical, of his fellows ?

Such individuals — so history would appear to teach — have always done, and always will do, what the Community collectively never have done, and never will do: *i.e.* been ready to run risks, to bear abnormal burdens, to execute and achieve what a first-class mind can alone do, and what the best officials rarely succeed in doing, *i.e. originate and lead.* For the motto of a first-class mind is the motto of Nelson, "Death or Westminster Abbey," and the ideal of the community is always "A comfortable villa on the sunny side of the road," and "Let me live like Brown or Robinson, and let my last end be like his."

In a word, you can *not* have progress and absolute financial and social equality walking hand-in-hand. On the contrary, history invariably teaches that, while half of progress is due to altruism and collectivism, the other half of progress is due to self-assertion, individualism and *inequality*, *i.e.* to leadership. Nor is there any instance in history of any community who have succeeded until they have found a leader, to goad them out of their self-complacent, primitive, Communism, and until, within moral, and not Sultanesque, limits, they have submitted themselves to his masterful control, and paid the price which, under one form or other, all leaders

are compelled to exact from their followers.

In other words, I cordially submit that a wise and practical Nation will never blindly worship the collective principle, but, in an age like our own, when there is undoubted need for Neo-Catholic Collectivism—to correct the gross evils of an excessive Individualism—which has held the field for three centuries—will rather recognise the profound truth expressed by Burke, when he said :—

“ It is no inconsiderable part of wisdom to know how much of an evil ought to be tolerated ; lest by attempting a degree of purity impracticable. . . . instead of cutting off the subsisting ill-practices, new corruptions might be produced for the concealment and security of the old.”<sup>(a)</sup>

What, then, I submit is, that it is foolish to suppose that the community can, or ought, to collectivize everything ! And I am opposed to this ideal because it is obvious, on the face of it, that a community in which *everything* was managed by the community, would be without that individual liberty which is so absolutely vital to intellectual, scientific, and business progress through the business pioneer. And that it is further foolish because a moderate amount of *laissez faire* in trade is necessary for the progressive development of those scientific discoveries which will, eventually, diminish labour and

---

<sup>(a)</sup> “ Thoughts on the Present Discontents,” by Edmund Burke, 1770, ii., 73.



degrading toil of all kinds, as it has largely done already.

To illustrate this point let us take the case of the gas supply in a town. Surely the wisest course for a town to pursue with regard to its gas supply is not to municipalize the gas-supply, but rather to let a "Company" have the right to supply the town with gas for a given number of years, but subject to certain conditions. By so doing, the gas company, and not the community, take the risk which arises, if a new form of light, better than gas, arises. Let the town or the community secure a monopoly of such a thing as coal-gas, and there is evidence<sup>(a)</sup> to show that the community and its comfortable municipal servants will be lazy enough to resist that spirit of scientific progress, whereby private genius and initiative discovers new forms of light which are cleaner and cheaper than municipal coal-gas: and which, for all we can tell, may be even more marvellous than electricity.

To illustrate the same point by a second example, let us suppose that, in 1801, when the first experiments in steam-navigation were made on the Thames, the community had, at vast cost, nationalized all the canals and paid for them a price (as undoubtedly they would, if such nationalization had been carried out) based on the assumption that steam

---

(a) See "Socialism in the Local Government Board," by W. G. Towler (George Allen).



navigation on canals would be a method of transit *for all time*. If, I say, the community had done this what fools the community would have looked, and been! and what a bad bargain the community would have made, twenty or thirty years later, when it became apparent to all, that the canal would be—as it has been—superseded by the Railway! The canal would be a National Mare's nest.

Following this train of thought—surely a wise one!—what idiots we shall be, if, at vast cost, we nationalize our Railways in 1911, only to discover, in 1921, that Railways may be as comparatively useless as canals now are, because, by a rapid diffusion of our population, and a development of æroplanes, all passengers will travel by the air, all light goods by local motor car, running on special new-built roads<sup>(b)</sup> and that Railways, being only wanted for carrying very heavy goods, are destined to be supplanted by motors, mono-rails and æreoplanes and degenerate as the canals have degenerated. For who will now venture to say, looking back on the past, that this will not occur?

---

(b) See "Anticipations," by H. G. Wells.

## III.

## SUMMARY.

## A COMMON-SENSE NEO-CATHOLIC VIA-MEDIA.

To sum up, we now perceive that exclusive Collectivism applied in a wholesale, whole-hog, manner to industry, would spell scientific stagnation, and would prevent practical leadership. For it assumes that industry and mechanism are fully developed; whereas, as a matter of fact, they are both still in their infancy; and it assumes that all men are equal, whereas there is a vast difference in their abilities, and struggle and competition alone bring out the best men to the top.

On the other hand, we do not quite want a reckless Individualism, under which, as at present, an increasing crowd of soft irresponsible Shareholders—the idle and, occasionally, degenerate descendants of over-worked business organizers—draw vast incomes out of wealth created so largely by Humanity & Co., but do not, in return for their community-created incomes, fulfil functions which make them worth their salt to the rest of their fellow-countrymen. For this principle does not make for leadership by the fittest, but leadership by the fattest!

What, then, is required to effect that vital end of modern statesmanship, a workable via-media between Individualism and Collectivism?

What is surely wanted is, not Socialism but Neo-Catholic Collectivism, a movement which, by

moral devices, will limit what is now the Sultanesque Monarchy of the Financial Chief, Landlord and Shareholder, and balance their rights to utilize social Machinery for their personal benefit, by corresponding duties that, like our Norman nobility, they should endow the Church and make it a Householder, and, later on, a Shareholder—but not a Manager—in Industry.

Turning from Plutocracy to Democracy our Neo-Catholic Institution will have to assist in securing justice for, and at the same time, disciplining, the ordinary working man—who will place himself under its *ægis* as he acquires confidence in its methods. To do this efficiently it will have to become a Landlord, owning his house, and, in course of time, a Shareholder, with an interest in the business where he works, an interest which it employs for moral ends.

To sum up, the Social Problem may be conveniently divided into two halves.

(1) The problem of making the Home the basis of Social Reform, and, to that end, making the Church once more a Landlord.

(2) The problem of moralizing, or Catholicizing, trade and legacies, and, in course of time, making the Church a powerful Shareholder, but not a Manager, in industry.

Let us now approach these new functions of the Church in Part II.

---

PART II.

---

*"Everything that has been done in the world  
has been done by faith."*—

MARTIN LUTHER.

*"Individuals may form communities, but it is  
institutions alone that can create a Nation."*—

BEACONSFIELD.

*"To make benevolence scientific is the great  
problem of the present age."*—

ARNOLD TOYNBEE.

*"He that believeth shall not make haste."*—

ISAIAH.

*"Naught shall make us rue  
If England to herself shall be but true."*—

SHAKESPEARE.



# CHURCH AND NATION.

## PART II.

---

### CHAPTER VII.

#### THE CHURCH AS SHAREHOLDER :

OR

#### MORALIZING TRADE.

“O gentlemen! the time of life is short;  
To spend that shortness basely, were too long.”—

SHAKESPEARE.

King Henry V., Act V., Scene II.

In our last chapter we saw that our Neo-Catholic programme for the solution of the Social Problem divides itself into two halves (i.) moralizing housing, (ii.) moralizing trade—the first of these two being comparatively simple : the second more complex.

But this volume is not an academic treatise. It is written with a view to getting something done. It is, therefore, vital for the reader to close it with a clear impression of the practical steps which can *immediately* be taken towards establishing a Neo-Catholic Institution in every town and village of

our land. To this end it is more practical to consider the more complex half of the Social Problem first, and end with what is, essentially, the simpler half. By this means the reader will conclude with a clearer idea as to what to do and how to do it, than if we discussed the more complex functions of the Church as Shareholder last.

## I.

### MORALIZING PROTECTED TRADE.

First, then, as to the moralizing of Protected Trade.

PROTECTION, OF SOME SORT, BEING NOW ELECTORALLY INEVITABLE, THE MAIN DUTY OF ALL PARTIES IS NOT TO SPEECHIFY ABOUT IT, BUT TO MORALIZE ITS COMING FROM THE START, SO AS TO AVOID THE EVILS WHICH HAVE ARISEN UNDER PROTECTION IN AMERICA.

The first point submitted is that the advocates of Protection, possessing as they do the majority of newspapers in the country, have conducted their propaganda with such zeal that I am addressing a generation, the majority of whom, for good or ill, have made up their minds to have Protection. No eloquence on the part of the minority could now stop Protection from coming. It follows that if the minority, who feel that the evils of Protection outweigh its advantages, are wise, their best policy is not to oppose Protection in a hot-headed unscientific fashion. It is rather to accept the large element

which is good in it ; and, by throwing in their lot with moderate tariff reformers, moralize the movement, and prevent it from falling into the hands of selfish extremists, as it unquestionably will, if it meets with pig-headed opposition. For like begets like : and what we want to-day is not pig-headed partisanship, but cool, deliberate, and, as far as is humanly possible, scientific statesmanship.

DIFFERENCE BETWEEN PROTECTION UNDER A KINGLY  
BISMARCKIAN EXECUTIVE AND IN A PARTY-CONTROLLED  
COUNTRY.

The second point submitted is one made by Arnold Toynbee.<sup>(a)</sup> It is that, while Protection may be good under a benevolent despot ; under a *party* system of Government, it must be carefully watched, to prevent it from being controlled by those who are likely personally to benefit by it.

In other words, we do not want to be governed by Merchants and Tradesmen or their political nominees. We want to be governed by statesmen ; and, entering, as we are, upon an era when Parliament will be legislating, more than in the past, on questions of trade, it follows that there is a quite unusual need for care in the selection of Members of Parliament. For if Protection is to offer a solution to certain aspects of the Social Problem, it must not be passed, as Free Trade was, seventy years ago, by well-meaning but half-educated, self-made, Manufacturers, who thought that nothing in the world

---

(a) Industrial Revolution, Popular Edition, p. 59.

mattered except pushing our manufactures of cotton fabric, cloth and machinery, all over the world, and securing, as they thought we should, a *permanent* world-wide monopoly for these articles. It must rather be controlled by Members of Parliament, and Neo-Catholic Wardens, who take broad and far-sighted views of our needs, and who have the moral courage to be uninfluenced by the short-sighted financial considerations of those business men who want Tariff Reform for personal ends, but are often—relatively speaking—just as ignorant of the social and moral aspects of business as were Cobden and Co., who opposed the beneficent Factory Acts initiated by the late Lord Shaftesbury.

AN IMPORTANT SOCIAL AND MORAL ADVANTAGE OF TARIFFS IS THAT THEY CAN BE USED TO CREATE NEW FORMS OF EMPLOYMENT ALTOGETHER.

The third point submitted is that it never occurred to Mr. Cobden, and our unscientific early-Victorian ancestors, to ask whether there might, or might not, be social, artistic, and other reasons, why our population should be encouraged to devote themselves to the production of other and more beautiful articles than cotton, cloth, and machinery, on lines which would make for a more equitable distribution of population over this once fair Britain of ours. They begged the question, with scarce a moment's hesitation, in favour of cheapness of production, and worshipped cotton, cloth, and machinery as if there were little else Britannia need bother about.

Take, for instance, the case of—shall we say the silk industry?—*a fabric which is used almost entirely by the rich*. Now surely it does not, in such an instance, irrefutably follow, that just because France has peculiar natural advantages for manufacturing silk in the Rhone valley, where mulberries abound, and can turn out silk ten, or fifteen, per cent cheaper than we can, we should not, if necessary, by the artificial device of low tariffs, deliberately enable silk to be manufactured once more in this country, on terms which will compensate those who weave silk for our slight natural disadvantages.

This is what our rivals have done in regard to the production of those products where we possess a unique natural advantage over them. Germany—for instance—is well aware that in the North of England we possess a moist atmosphere which is unique for spinning cotton, and that, in the same neighbourhood, we possess coal and iron for making and running machinery. What has Germany done? Has she adopted our plan and declared “I will make nothing for which Germany is not naturally adapted.”? No! Germany has determined to conquer her slight natural disadvantages by art. By means of sprays in her factories she creates an atmosphere as moist as that of Lancashire, and by means of tariffs she atones to German workmen and masters for the fact that coal and iron are not in such close proximity to their factories as with us. She uses science to combat her natural disadvantages and does not



rush to the conclusion that she must be the creature of her environment. She creates environment, and uses her wits to provide *variety* of employment. "There are," she says, "moral and social reasons why we, in Germany, should spin our own cotton, even if it costs us a trifle more to do so. We decline to confine our attention to a few forms of production. We will have as many strings to our bow as possible."

Now, surely we, in Britain, should be wise to reflect on this question. With us, too, there are moral and social facts to be considered besides mere fractional cheapness : and the question whether such a comparative luxury as silk ought, or ought not, to be produced in Britain is one which ought not surely to be settled, either by the whole-hog notion that there should be no tariffs, nor yet by allowing tariffs to become a modern idol, to which we must bow down with that same blindness with which we have long bowed down to Cheapness, and to the whole-hog idea of regarding nothing but the interests of the Consumer, *even when, as in the case of the silk industry, the Consumer implies the well-to-do.*

In distinguishing between tariffs on articles which, like silk, are luxuries, and ordinary articles of consumption, I am not, it must be remembered, airing my own views but those of the late Lord Salisbury ;\*

---

\* "I think we have a right to ask," said Lord Salisbury, "without pledging ourselves to any opinion, until the facts are known, that there should be a thorough investi-

and this appears to be an aspect of fiscal change upon which Unionist Free Traders—such as Lord Hugh Cecil and Lord Cromer—whom all classes respect—and Social Reform Liberals, can join with Tariff Reformers.

For if you put a tariff on goods coming in which are *luxuries*, and thus enable such goods to be produced in this country which would otherwise be produced elsewhere, you are creating new and more

---

gation into the question, whether we are now pursuing the right course for the purpose of inducing those other Governments in some degree to lower the terrible wall of tariffs, which is shutting out the productions of our industry from the markets of the world. But if you make a suggestion of this kind you are immediately told, 'This is reciprocity and retaliation, and behind it lurks the shadow of protection.' Reciprocity and retaliation! But what are these commercial treaties if they do not involve the principle of reciprocity? There is no doubt that by abandoning duties, which are useful to you for revenue purposes, you confer a great benefit on foreign countries. Why should you not ask for a price in exchange for that benefit—why should you not obtain for your own industries a benefit corresponding to that which you are conferring upon them? I do not know, until inquiry has been made, and opportunities gained of ascertaining, whether it presses either upon the food of our people, or the raw material of our industry, both of which must be held sacred. But in spite of any formulas, in spite of any cry of free trade, if I saw that, by raising a duty upon luxuries, or threatening to raise it, I could exercise a pressure upon foreign powers, and induce them to lower their tariffs, I should pitch orthodoxy to the winds, and exercise that pressure."—Life and Speeches of LORD SALISBURY.

varied forms of employment *without hurting anyone*. Such change appears to be extremely necessary, inasmuch as there are clear indications that other Nations are, by the artificial aid of tariffs, manufacturing more and more of that cotton and machinery of which we once had a practical monopoly, and for which we possess peculiar natural advantages. If they overcome natural disadvantages by artificial means, so must we. Why should not Britannia have a silk as well as a cotton string to her bow ; and how can anyone, who cares for the poor, object to the idea that, in selecting certain new industries for artificial protection, we should first select those which—like silk—are consumed by the rich ?

CHIEF MORAL AND SOCIAL ADVANTAGE OF PROTECTION IS THAT, BY LIMITING THE AREA OF COMPETITION, IT WILL MAKE IT POSSIBLE FOR US TO MORALIZE TRADE WITHIN THE PROTECTED AREA.

The fourth and chief point submitted is that it is worth while for us to have Protection in order to limit the area of competition ; *i.e.*, in order that, within a large area, containing a population of forty-five millions, we may moralize the conditions under which industry is carried on.

In other words, if we are to set out, as a Nation, to do what we have not done for three hundred years : *i.e.*, really moralize trade on a National Scale (as it was moralized locally in the Middle Ages), we must, within common-sense limits, isolate

the Home Market on National lines, as the market of the mediæval town was isolated in the Middle Ages.\* For, owing to the fact that means of transit were bad, the mediæval town was not subject to competition from outside, and we cannot hope to arrive at a system of righteous prices and righteous wages, unless, for moral ends, we adopt artificial devices for limiting competition within a national area, and bring back the power of the Church.

“Ah!” cries a reader, “but is it so necessary to limit the area of competition in Britain and the Dominions? Is not the ideal towards which Humanity will eventually come that of universal free trade?”

No, sir, I am confident that it is not. When Mr. Cobden, and his great colleague, Mr. John Bright, expected that universal free trade would come, they did not foresee—as John Bright has confessed†—the immense growth of American and German trade,

---

\* See Chapter IV.

† LOCHBUIE, ISLE MULL,

4th January, 1906.

To the Editor of the “Scotsman.”

Sir,—I had the pleasure of frequently meeting the late Mr. John Bright, who was an indefatigable fisherman. Many a “crack” we have had over those precarious creatures, fish, and fishing. One day, however, our conversation turned to politics. I asked Mr. Bright his opinion of Free Trade. I shall never forget his reply, which was the following, viz. :—“When Cobden and I introduced Free Trade, we thought that the whole world would join us; but now we find that they have not, something must be



still less did they anticipate the establishment of factories in China, Japan and India. For, if you will only think it out, a system of universal free trade means *absolutely unmitigated attempts to undersell going on from one end of the globe to the other*: a state of things which, if practically carried out, can only ultimately result in China, Japan, and India, where labour—the most expensive item in production—is cheapest and most abundant, becoming the Workshop of the World.

#### EVILS OF PROTECTIONIST MONOPOLIES.

“But has Protection no evils?” says a reader. “Does not it tend to the creation of monopolies which are abused?”

Obviously, Protection has grave evils of which we all know, but against which we can, before we introduce it into a Church country, guard, if we are only wise in time. Protection implies that protected Firms receive, from the rest of their fellow countrymen, a gift in the form of a monopoly of the Home

---

done.” I have not the pleasure of Mr. Chamberlain’s acquaintance; but this I say from the bottom of my heart, that I sincerely trust that his fiscal policy will soon become law, and, in my humble opinion, when it does become law, there will be no need to go round with the hat for the unemployed.—I am, etc.,

MACLAINE OF LOCHBUIE.

Quoted from a volume entitled “Tariff Reform, a Plea for Fair Trade,” by Alexander Forbes, J.P., Ex-President Aberdeen Chamber of Commerce. (Aberdeen and North of Scotland Printing Co.).



Market, and such monopolies may be grievously abused.

Of such monopolies too many of those Unionists who advocate Tariff Reform, tell us nothing ; and men who do not tell the whole truth about Tariff Reform, are just as much to blame as those Liberals who object to cheap, foreign labour in theory, and encourage it in practice.

In other words, neither one-sided Tariff Reformers, nor one-sided Free Importers, tell us the whole truth. Both are—I speak in no spirit of malice—telling us only half the truth. And those Britons who value the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, will increasingly recognise the need for a nobler National Institution than the House of Commons : an Institution which, owning wealth bestowed on it for the benefit of the community, will have a powerful non-party voice with which to enlighten the community on the social and moral aspects of trade.

“On what lines,” you ask, “would such a powerful Neo-Catholic Institution throw the weight of its influence as regards Protection ?”

It would, I submit, recognise that, in order to limit the area of competition, it is good for the community, by means of Protection, to give a monopoly of the Home Market to certain Firms, consisting of Shareholders, Managers, and men. Such Shareholders, Managers, and men, our Neo-Catholic corporation

would urge, are, however, bound, in honour, not to abuse such monopolies by raising prices unjustly. For they are given monopolies in order to solve the problem of unemployment, to secure steady wages, and free the working classes from the competition of cheap foreign labour. They are not given a monopoly in order to raise prices unjustly. No mandate is given to them to charge unjust prices, and the owners of the *Times*, the *Morning Post*, the *Standard*, and the *Daily Express*, and all who have done so much to further Protection—are in honour bound to make this point clear before the next election : viz., *no Protectionist mandate for raising prices unjustly—only a Protectionist mandate for new forms of employment and for limiting the area of competition.*

“ But, human nature being what it is,” says a reader, “ and business men being animated, exclusively, by self-interest, how can we hope that men to whom monopolies are given will not abuse them ? ”

That, sir, is just what I deny. I deny utterly that the business men of Britain are to-day animated merely by motives of self-interest. On the contrary, I perceive that an annually increasing number of such men are animated by nobler motives than grabbing self-interest. The trouble is that we have no Neo-Catholic Institution, or Corporation, which, through its individual members and the possession of its own non-party newspapers, appeals to nothing but honour and duty and right in business matters.

HOW FAR THE STATE CAN PREVENT PROTECTIONIST  
MONOPOLIES FROM BEING ABUSED?

Before proceeding to point out the precise manner in which a powerful Neo-Catholic Corporation would prevent monopolies from being abused, let me cordially submit that if Liberals are really honestly convinced that moral reform can best be achieved through "the State," the remedy against the evils of Protection lies in their own hands. All they have to do is to *have the courage of their convictions* and "dish" the purely selfish tariff reformer, by introducing Protectionist monopolies themselves, on precisely the same conditions that monopolies are given, in so many of our towns, to gas and water companies; *i.e.*, on lines whereby, when monopoly profits exceed a certain margin, profits shall be devoted to cheapen the price to the Consumer: though how our "State-believing" friends are to check these profits I do not understand.

In this connection I must—in no ungenerous spirit—point out that, if "the State" under our Party Constitution is to do this, and reconcile the Manufacturers of this country to such a comparatively new departure as the above policy would imply, Liberals must drop their present device of promoting self-sacrifice by means of "Bung" placards and spite, and adopt a more truthful, tactful, and scientific attitude towards such manufacturers. They must remember the ideal which Shakespeare put into the mouth of the last mediæval Church

statesman, Cardinal Wolsey :—

“Love thyself last : cherish those hearts that hate thee  
Still in thy right hand carry gentle peace  
To silence envious tongues : be just and fear not  
Let all the ends thou aim'st at be thy country's  
Thy God's and Truth's.”

By the adoption of such a courteous and truthful method of promoting self-sacrifice, they might, indeed, do much to reconcile the interests of Consumers and Producers. But, even so, it must be obvious that the self-restraint which, on the above lines, would be asked of the Manufacturers of Britain, would be such that it could obviously be advocated to most effect by Churchmen (using this term in its widest sense) rather than forced on by party politicians, and checked by an army of State Accountants.

HOW OUR PRACTICAL, PROPERTIED, NEO-CATHOLIC CORPORATION WOULD PREVENT MONOPOLIES FROM BEING ABUSED.

This, however, only brings us back to the old conclusion that our wisest course is for the moral aspects of trade to be taken up boldly by a Neo-Catholic Corporation, composed of all Social Reformers, which shall appeal fair and square to the innate desire of all classes to do what is right. Such a Corporation will tell all masters and men, all Managing-Directors, and all Shareholders, to whom monopolies have been given (in the form of Protection) by the rest of their fellow-countrymen, that they are given monopolies to use and not to abuse,



and that if, in consequence of competition being eliminated, their incomes and fortunes are largely increased, the only honourable course for them to take is voluntarily to hand over a large portion of their extra gain to a Neo-Catholic Institution in order to make it—for moral ends—a powerful Shareholder—though not a Manager—in such a protected industry.

It is needless to point out that, so soon as, in consequence of this step, a Neo-Catholic Institution has become a preponderant Shareholder in such a protected industry, it will—with the additional aid of Neo-Catholic newspapers—be strong enough, both financially and morally, to prevent monopolies from being abused, and to safe-guard the righteous interests of Consumers, as the mediæval Church did in the case of corn.

As an illustration of how a capitalised mediæval Church, was able to guarantee the interest of consumers, let us take the following instance, which I quote from *Annals of the British Peasantry*, by Russell M. Garnier, B.A. (Sonnenschein).

“There was no person,” says a contemporary writer<sup>(a)</sup> “that came to them (the monks) heavy or sad, for any cause, that went away comfortless; they never revenged them of any injury, but were content to forgive it freely or upon submission; *and if the price of corn had begun to start up in the market, they*

---

(a) Cole MSS., Vol. XII., p. 8, *The Fall of Religious Houses*.



*made thereunto with wain loads of corn, and sold it under the market to poor people, to the end to bring down the price thereof."*

Is it unreasonable to suppose that a powerful wealthy Neo-Catholic Corporation controlled by Social wardens and financed by voluntary endowments, could achieve, on modernized Twentieth Century lines, what was achieved so successfully in the Middle Ages by the Monks? Why, if the Church Army, or the Salvation Army were properly capitalized and were run as a National concern on business lines, it could do this very thing to-morrow.

LET US GIVE BOLD BUT GENTLE CHURCH METHODS A CHANCE BEFORE WE USE "STATE" FORCE.

"Yes," says a reader, "what you say is all very well, but supposing the men in question refuse to endow a Neo-Catholic corporation, and ignore the appeals to honour which such an Institution, through its Members and newspapers, makes to them, what then?"

In that case, if men—whose vast fortunes are due to Humanity and Co., assisted by Monopolies given them, for *moral* ends, by their trusting fellow-Britons—do not respond to appeals to their honour, then it will be time enough for the House of Commons and "the State" to treat their Monopoly Companies as honour-lacking felons, and for "the State" and Law Courts to impose immensely heavy Rooseveltian fines Only, instead of spending the

proceeds of such fines, as President Roosevelt did, on current "State" expenses, hand such fines over to a Neo-Catholic corporation, in order that it may acquire, in course of time, shares in such culprit Trusts—which will give it a right to exercise a moral influence in the direction of their affairs.

What we have to do, so to speak, is to give the principle of honour a chance before we resort to "State" force and political spite for a solution of moral ills. And to give the principle of honour a chance we must embody it, with some circumstance and ceremony, in the form of a Neo-Catholic Institution, holding its annual meetings in—say the House of Lords—under the presidency of her Majesty, the Queen, as representing, in her person, the women and children of Britain, whose welfare is mainly concerned.

If, by working on these pacific Christian lines, and appealing to all that is highest in human nature, we cannot moralize protected trade, then it will, I submit, be quite time enough for "the State" to step in and treat men, or companies of men, who abuse monopolies, as felons, and use against them that force—in the shape of police and legislation—which accompanies all "State" action. For as has been well said by an eminent Churchman in a passage, to which I invite careful attention :—

"The State has been called the armed conscience of the community. Looked at on the moral side, as

a guide of the conscience of individuals *its arms are its defect*. But that defect is not remediable: it is inevitable. For the State has to deal with various grades of character, responding to a vast complexity of motives, which may be roughly classified under three heads, those of duty, self-interest, and fear of punishment. To some 'you ought' is a sufficient appeal, to others 'you had better,' while to a third class the only effective appeal is 'you must.' Now the State in order to perform its elementary business, that of securing the conditions of an ordered and civilized life, has to deal first with those who are only susceptible of the lowest motive, the dread of punishment. And in dealing with them, it must of necessity use coercive force. *But the force-associations which thus grow up around all State action weaken and enervate its appeal to the higher motives* those of duty and rational self-interest. The very suspicion of compulsion taints the act done from duty. . . . Now it is exactly at these points that the Church steps in to supplement the moral action of the State, not as one part supplements another part of a single whole, but rather as a higher supplements a lower order. *It is in its appeal to the higher motives that the State is weak, it is in its appeal to the higher motives that the Church is strong.*"\*

---

\* Lux Mundi. XI. "Christianity and Politics." It is note-worthy that this same article supports Lord Beaconsfield's contention as to the hostility of Whiggism, to the Church, in the following passage :—

"It was the policy of the ruling Whig oligarchy to keep

It follows, I submit, that, instead of haggling, or using spite, against those who benefit by protection, our Neo-Catholic Institution must go boldly on the principle, "I never trust a gentleman by halves."

#### A REPLY TO THE SCEPTICAL CRITIC.

Here, however, I must pause. For, a reader will urge, "What you say is all very well, but I cannot believe so great a change will take place in our present business 'system' that, 'national Trusts' having been formed, a large proportion of the shares in those Trusts will be held by a Neo-Catholic Institution—such shares having been voluntarily bequeathed to it by 'Trust' Millionaires. For my part I would rather see none of these big Trusts, or Combines, formed, but would rather the present business system remained as it is!"

---

down the Church, and they succeeded—to the grave loss of English morality. If in some degree the Church in England at the present time is speaking with firmer accent on questions of personal class morality, and giving more effective witness against the luxury and neglect of their work-people, which are the besetting sins of the great English manufacturing classes, it is due partly to the revival in England of the true idea of the Church as a great spiritual society, and partly to the fact that English statesmen, from sheer inability owing to the conditions of political life to do otherwise, have left her more free to manage her own business and to develop her mission to the English people in accordance with the laws and aspirations of her own inner life."—LUX MUNDI.



In answer to such an objection, may I submit as follows. You cannot, sir, truthfully speak of business in Britain, at the present time, as if it were a set system. Business is not a cast-iron system. It is a living organism made up of men, machinery, and customs, among which the human and moral element predominates. Since the *Industrial Revolution*, a hundred-and-fifty years ago, the Business Organism has been in a state of constant growth, moral and social, as well as physical and commercial. Only a hundred years ago, for instance, it was not thought wrong, by many persons, for little girls of thirteen, to be employed in coal mines, under what we should now regard as the most brutal conditions; while the great and good Doctor Arnold of Rugby, described Trades Unions as "gangs of conspirators." During our own lives we have each of us seen the most amazing growth of the Business Organism, morally—socially—and physically—and are, in consequence, aware that the Organism will continue to develop and throw out new shoots. Only, inasmuch as the chief element in the business Organism is *man*, it is for us to settle what shoots we require, instead of leaving that growth to chance.

What, then, I submit is, that we can no more, if we mean to prosper, stop the organization of business into big National Organisms than, in British History, our ancestors could prevent the development of our savage heptarchic tribes into a compact nation under a King. But, just as when a



powerful King, like Henry VII., had welded us into a Nation, we did not allow our Kings to consolidate the country, politically speaking, purely for their own personal benefit, so too, we are not going to stand by and allow individual Millionaire Kings to consolidate trade for their own personal ends. We are going—Conservatives and Liberals alike—to limit their Monarchy, as we have limited the Monarchy of our Kings. What I merely submit is, in the first place, that it is as beneficial to the community for business to be consolidated, and needless competition repressed, as it was good for the Nation to be consolidated, and tribal warfare suppressed. For, as financial competition decreases, we shall have greater leisure to compete for nobler ends than mere money-making, just as when tribal warfare ceased we first found the leisure for business. The second question—in many respects the question of the century—is, what are our best weapons for limiting the Monarchy of the masterful consolidating Millionaire or Financial King, to prevent him from consolidating business for his own personal ends ?

#### A LITTLE CHILD SHALL LEAD THEM.

Are we to confront such Kings of Commerce with a political sword, and limit their Monarchy with the "big stick" of a political Roosevelt ? What I say is "No !" Deep as is my admiration for Mr. Roosevelt, I am confident that Mr. Roosevelt will, ere long, agree that he who would make Millionaires the servants of the Church, must throw aside political

devices, swords, and sticks, and approach the Monarchs of Modern Commerce, carrying in his arms a little child, and saying :—

“ You mighty Millionaires, who have the ability to eliminate needless commercial competition and organize industry on a National Scale, we have to-day reached a pitch of Civilization when, in response to the united wishes of your countrymen, you must, for the sake of this little one, bequeath a large proportion of your vast shares, *of your own free will*, to a practical, propertied Church, to a Neo-Catholic—*i.e.*, Lay-controlled—Institution, whose object will be to be a big National Shareholder—not a Manager—in industry : using its power to consider the righteous claims of the consumer, and devoting its profits to vastly improving our present scheme of National, moral, and technical Education ; and to the creation of a greener, cleaner, environment, than exists at present, for the children of the land we love. For of too many of them it is, alas, true that :

“ They look up with their pale and sunken faces,  
And their looks are dread to see,  
For they mind you of their angels in high places,  
With eyes turned on Deity.  
‘ How long,’ they say, ‘ how long, O cruel nation,  
Will you stand, to move the world, on a child’s heart,—  
Stifle down with a mailed heel its palpitantion,  
And tread onward to your throne amid the mart ?  
Our blood splashes upward, O gold-heaper,  
And your purple shows your path !  
But the child’s sob in the silence curses deeper  
Than the strong man in his wrath.’ ”

## II.

## MORALIZING FINANCE.

And now it will be necessary to note another important aspect of that worship of competition-created cheapness which Mr. Chamberlain failed to consider when introducing — with perhaps slight acquaintance with History — his anti-Cobdenite proposals.

This aspect of the Mid-Victorian ideal of favouring the Consumer regardless of the wages of home producers, and regardless of the quality of the goods produced, is that aspect of Industrialism under which the Banking Institutions of this country have long indulged in a system of "Free Trade" with their depositors' money, on lines which are frequently calculated to promote excessive competition, to foster thereby "sweating," the production of shoddy articles, and other evils.

Historically speaking, these evils arose from the multiplicity of competing Banks all over the country half-a-century ago. Many of these small Banks were borrowing from their depositors at too high a rate, and lending out imprudently, with the result that, to save failure, and eliminate dangerous competition, they have followed the process which we have just described, and have wisely amalgamated, the weaker with the stronger, into something approaching National Corporations. Indeed, nothing is more remarkable than the rapidity with which

these amalgamations have taken place during the last thirty years, happily for the credit of the country.

The time is now, however, ripe for the further step, which I have just urged, to be taken with a view to limiting the virtual Financial Monarchy of Banking Directors in London, and to securing that Bank amalgamations are made for the benefit, not of the Kings of Finance, but of their subjects. For the power of lending being now directed from a single centre, viz. London, by a few gentlemen—general Managers and heads of departments—the quasi-monarchical responsibilities concentrated in a few hands, require to be tactfully “limited” in the interest of the provinces, and the Empire as a whole.

For while it is the duty of the Banks to their depositors to see that their moneys are lent out in such places, and in such a manner, as will ensure their prompt return; and while this necessitates that capital should be spread over a wide geographical area, the extent to which, for instance, the Banks encourage the flotation of foreign loans, or the establishment of the big Metropolitan Emporium, will necessitate, ere long, that provincial depositors should possess some reasonable guarantee that their own deposits are not being lent to foreign or Metropolitan concerns which exist largely for the purpose of under-selling them.

In addition to this, it is the duty and interest of depositors and Banks alike, that the latter should



not lend financial encouragement to Firms whose careless treatment of employees results in social ills, which are actually increasing municipal and national taxation, of which depositors and Banks alike, in their characters as ratepayers, have to pay, and may have to pay for more heavily each succeeding winter.

To sum up, may we not hope the Banks will, ere long, recognise that, when deciding to whom they make loans, in given districts, in the future, they would be serving the welfare of all classes if they endeavoured to take into account such questions as :

(1) Whether the loan is to be used to foster unnecessary competition in the district.

(2) Whether the borrower—be he individual or Firm—bears a reputation for the just treatment of employees.

(3) To what extent it is desirable to assist the flotation of loans outside the Empire, the proceeds of which may be used to foster that very competition which keeps wages in certain trades, so low. For it is true that, in their origin, German and American trade have largely been built up with British capital.

(4) Whether greater facilities ought to be given by the Banks for loans for agricultural purposes, than are given at present. It is presumably the ease with which a single loan of £10,000 can be made, as regards detail, compared with 100 loans of £100 each, that at present discourages Bankers from



this class of business, profitable though it is, beneficial to the community, and such as, ere long, Public Opinion will press the Joint Stock Banks to undertake—as a reasonable proportion of their business—or see agricultural Banks, started for this special purpose, acquiring a wide popularity.

(5) Whether—which it should surely be possible to judge—the community, at large, is likely to be rather benefitted or injured, by the transaction.\*

Important as are the above propositions, it must never be forgotten that, in a country whose prosperity depends so largely on credit, anything in the nature of an organised agitation against the Banks, might result in attempts to promote commercial morality, bringing about commercial disaster. It follows that, in asking Bankers, with their unique experience of every trade in the country, to lend that assistance which they unquestionably *can*, to the discouraging of firms who “sweat” their employees, or abuse protection monopolies — our

---

\* There are also such subsidiary questions as the following, into which I cannot enter in the present volume, important as they are, viz. :—

(i.) Whether borrowers, whose abnormal proclivities for gambling, either on the Stock Exchange or the Turf, are well-known, should not be discouraged.

(ii.) How far it is desirable, in view of the comparatively recent industrial development of the East, for the Banks to assist the flotation of loans outside Western Civilization, without moral stipulations, and the power to enforce them, as to the treatment of native employees.

most statesmanlike course must be—until experience has taught us to the contrary—to rely boldly on the honour of Banking Directors and Managers. For they will themselves be most capable of indicating the precise lines whereby they could bring some of their present Cobdenite methods into line with the higher moral standard of the future. Nor will it—I am confident—be found that Bankers are less distinguished for their public-spirit, their honour, and their reverence for childhood, than any other class of business men.

It should, indeed, be most fully understood that, in making these suggestions, I imply no “attack” whatever on the Banks. The days when an ability to attack was part of the necessary equipment of him who would heal the wounds of the body politic, ended centuries since : and, as Lord Salisbury used to say, the days which necessitated violent surgery are dead. It is rather by those pacific and conciliatory devices whereby Lord Shaftesbury—himself a Conservative in politics—secured the passing of the Factory Acts, that I would urge the need, not for legislation to deal with the Banks, but for the Banks to reform themselves.

## CHAPTER VIII.

## MORALIZING LEGACIES

(A NEO-CATHOLIC ALTERNATIVE TO THOSE CLAUSES IN THE BUDGET FOR 1909 WHICH DEAL WITH UNEARNED INCREMENT):

OR

THE CHURCH AS SHAREHOLDER  
(concluded.)

"I am sure that I shall not be misled when, in a case of constitutional difficulty, I consult the genius of the English constitution."—*Burke*.

And now let us note that one of our primary aims, if we are really to moralize trade, must be a carefully-thought-out development of our present custom in regard to bequests at death.

The topic is, in more senses than one, a delicate one, which covers a wide area, "property" being, to-day, of different kinds compared to what it once was. All, therefore, that a popular treatise, like the present, can attempt is to submit the broad bedrock principles of such a development.

THERE HAS BEEN A NOTABLE CHANGE, SINCE 1760, IN THE NATURE OF PROPERTY, BUT OLD GEORGIAN CUSTOMS STILL APPLY TO THE INHERITANCE OF THESE NEW FORMS OF "PROPERTY."

Now this is an extremely important point to which it will be necessary for the reader to devote considerable reflection.

As we have seen, in countries where machinery and steam exist, and where density of population improves land value, all modern fortunes are, to a large extent, the product of Humanity and Co., and of social machinery, which has arisen since 1760.

On the other hand, *laws and customs* in reference to the bequeathing and inheriting this new and irresponsible type of community-created wealth (such as shares, which have no visible duties attaching to them) are the laws and customs which existed from 1550 to 1760, and not the collective laws and customs which existed previous to the destruction of corporate Church property at the Reformation.

THE CATHOLIC CUSTOM OF BEQUESTS TO THE CHURCH, FOR SOCIAL SERVICE, HAS NOT BEEN APPLIED SINCE THE REFORMATION TO NEW FORMS OF PROPERTY.

For it should be remembered that, previous to the Reformation, when we had a Catholic Constitution, the tenure of property and the bequeathing of property were both profoundly influenced by the Church. For it was customary for persons on their death-beds to endow that corporate

Church for social service, as it has not been customary to endow the Church for social service since the Reformation.

This fact was pointed out admirably by Lord Beaconsfield, so long ago as 1846, when replying to an attack which Mr. Cobden made upon the feudal system, in a speech to which I once more direct attention.

"Now what," said Disraeli—as he then was—"is the fundamental principle of the feudal system? It is that the tenure of all property shall be the performance of its duties. Why, when the Conqueror carved out parts of the land, and introduced the feudal system, he said to the recipient. "*You shall have that estate, but you shall do something for it: you shall feed the poor; you shall endow the Church; you shall defend the land in case of war; and you shall execute justice and maintain truth to the poor for nothing.*"

WE HAVE SUFFERED, SINCE THE REFORMATION, AS REGARDS OUR CUSTOM OF BEQUEATHING "PROPERTY," FROM A DOUBLE EVIL.

Now, if the reader will kindly reflect upon this situation he will, I think, agree that, since the Reformation, we have suffered, in this connection, from a double evil. For

(a) In the first place, we have, since the Reformation, possessed no Catholic Corporation for social service like the mediæval Church, to which it has been customary—as in the Middle Ages—to leave



property for social service ; our hatred of priest-craft having blinded us to the fact that you may have lay-controlled as well as priest-controlled Catholic property.

(b) On the other hand, property has, since 1760, absolutely changed its character. It is no longer, as in the Middle Ages, mainly agricultural property, with visible duties attaching to it, which, if neglected, makes him who neglects them, the scorn of the countryside. It is property of an *utterly irresponsible kind*,\* in the form of shares which have *no* visible

---

\* While differing from the materialistic attitude of Mr. H. G. Wells on many important points—the writer would here take the opportunity of acknowledging his indebtedness to Mr. H. G. Wells' brilliant sketch of the development of the mechanism of modern life, entitled "Anticipations." Had Mr. Wells had the good fortune to study Lord Beaconsfield's *Sybil*, and certain aspects of the history of the mediæval Church, there is evidence in "Anticipations" to show that Mr. Wells would have come near to the solution of the Social Problem suggested in these pages. In the following passage Mr. Wells expressed, with eminent lucidity ; the irresponsible nature of modern share-property.

"Before the eighteenth century," writes Mr. H. G. Wells, "the only property of serious importance consisted of land and buildings. These were "real" estate. Beyond these things were live-stock, serfs, and the furnishings of real estate, the surface aspect of real estate, so to speak, personal property, ships, weapons, and the Semitic invention of money. All such property had to be actually "held" and administered by the owner, he was immediately in connection with it and responsible for it. He could leave it only precariously to a steward and manager,

duties whatever attaching to them, or it is town land or country land which has increased in value, not because its owners have ploughed and drained and improved it, but because they have sat still and, owing to the vast increase of population, allowed Humanity and Co. to improve it, and their agents or solicitors to collect vastly increased rents on their behalf.

WHAT, THEN, ARE WE TO DO?

Now, hitherto, the only development in our Constitution which has taken place to meet the altered

---

and to convey the revenue of it to him at a distance was a difficult and costly proceeding. To prevent a constant social disturbance by lapsing and dividing property, and in the absence of any organized agency to receive lapsed property, inheritance and preferably primogeniture were of such manifest advantage that the old social organization always tended in the direction of these institutions. Such usury as was practised relied entirely on the land and the anticipated agricultural produce of the land.

“But the usury and the sleeping partnerships of the Joint Stock Company system which took shape in the eighteenth and the earlier half of the nineteenth century opened quite unprecedented uses for money, and created a practically new sort of property and a new proprietor class. The peculiar novelty of this property is easily defined. Given a sufficient sentiment of public honesty, share property is property that can be owned at any distance and that yields its revenue without thought or care on the part of its proprietor; it is, indeed, absolutely irresponsible property, a thing that no old world property ever was. But, in spite of its widely different nature, the laws of inheritance that the social necessities of the old order of things established have been applied to this new species of possession without remark.”—*Anticipations*, pp. 71-2.

character of our post-Reformation Constitution, and the altered character of "share-property," is (a) the system of increased Death Duties, initiated by Sir William Harcourt—(b) a recent Liberal Budget.

Under the Death Duties a man is coerced, at death, by law, to bequeath so much property to "the State," rather than, as in the Middle Ages, encouraged to leave it voluntarily to the Church.

Here we are faced by an extraordinary difference between mediæval and modern customs, certainly not creditable to post-Reformation statesmanship, in two notable respects.

(i.) In the first place, we must indeed be a poor lot if, despite our scientific advance, we require to be goaded to leave bequests to the community by the State, in a way that our Catholic ancestors who voluntarily endowed the Church, were not.

(ii.) In the second place, property now bequeathed to the State by compulsion, in the form of existing death-duties, is not, to-day, treated as capital. It is, on the contrary, converted into coin for *current expenses*, a singularly wasteful and demoralizing process.

In other words, the Nation, as regards Death Duties, at present adopts the spendthrift's device of—to a certain extent—living on its capital; a device which did not so much matter fifty years ago, when death duties were low, but which is unquestionably foolish when death-duties are as high as at present.

MR. LLOYD GEORGE'S ATTEMPT TO ARRIVE AT A  
JUSTER DISTRIBUTION OF WEALTH.

The other attempt to deal with new forms of wealth which have arisen since 1760, is the Budget, associated with the name of Mr. Lloyd George. According to this Budget, an attempt is to be made to value the land in the region of our towns and derive an increasing income from progressive taxes on unearned increment.

Now, I do not wish to be unfair to Mr. Lloyd George, because I am convinced of the sincerity of his desire to help the degraded. It is, therefore, with the frankest desire to respect both him and his attempts to remedy a great national evil that I submit three—as it appears to me—exceedingly weak spots in the armour of his political project.

(1) In the first place, it is difficult to understand any system of valuing the unearned increment on land in the region of great towns which will prevent the value of such land fluctuating immensely from year to year. It has been calculated by Mr. Lloyd George that it will take four years to make a complete valuation, and will cost £2,000,000. But, with new garden cities arising in our midst, with the most important development of agriculture taking place—likely to develop old county rather than industrial towns—above all, with such a cheapening of trams, motor cars, and motor omnibuses, going on, our suburbs are rapidly extending to such a distance



from towns that the *perpetual shifting of population, and hence of land values, will make the first valuation mere waste paper at the end of the four years it will take.*

In other words, valuing unearned increment is like photographing a bird on the wing. You can, in four years, at a cost of £2,000,000, snapshot it alright ! But by this time, owing to the rapid changes in the value of land, and the flight of population elsewhere, unearned increment will have shifted its position.

It surely follows that, if, as all parties are really agreed, it is morally indefensible for an individual to enjoy the proceeds of increment which he has not earned, we must not, I submit, use a State Photographer to snapshot this bird, but put some Christian salt on its tail and capture it for the community, by kindness rather than by curses. This is already being done, as I shall shortly shew.

(2) The second weakness of Mr. Lloyd George's scheme is, I submit, that it only considers unearned increment (or "fortunes" made in co-operation with Humanity and Co.) as regards land. Mr. Lloyd George makes no attempt whatever to appoint valuers to find out to what extent idle shareholders, speculators, or any other than owners of land, owe their fortunes to Humanity and Co., rather than to their personal exertions. He only "goes for" the man who owns land !



Now, I do not, mind you, submit that it would be possible for a valuer to snapshot moving unearned increment as regards shares. What I do say is that, if you attempt to arrive at a photographic valuation of flying unearned increment in the case of the Landed class, you must also attempt to arrive at a similar valuation in respect to the Shareholding class. This brings us to the startling truth that, mixed up with Mr. Lloyd George's sincere desire to help the degraded, there exists an apparent social bias against the owners of land. Now, I hold no brief for those whose land has improved in value without any toil on their part. What I do urge is, that it does not seem quite "cricket" that such persons should be singled out for attack and accused of "blackmailing," while, at the same time, speculators in shares, whose shares improve in value without their doing any work, and who are as wealthy as the land-owning class, should be allowed, by Mr. Lloyd George, to go scot free! If Mr. Lloyd George wishes to be a moral Arbitrator between rich and poor, he must not allow private bias against land-owners to influence his public judgment. For if, as Mr. Lloyd George asserts, such an one as the Duke of Westminster is a *Blackmailer*, his Grace's friends may fairly retort that they find in Mr. Lloyd George's methods a Twentieth Century embodiment of the Parable of the *Unjust Judge*.

(3) The above objections are, however, trifling compared with the big broad issue between Mr.

Lloyd George's State proposals, and the Neo-Catholic alternative suggested in these pages.

According to the School of Thought which Mr. Lloyd George has recently joined, our democratic State, controlled, in the last resort, by the "Man in the Street," is now to become a Moral Arbitrator between rich and poor ; and the question of a juster distribution of wealth is to be settled, at heated elections, by selecting a single class who own wealth due to unearned increment, and by placarding the streets against them with posters such as "Put the biggest burden on the broadest back."

Now, this kind of thing can be made to sound admirable, in theory, on a party platform. But in practice it implies a prolonged and bitter warfare between Capital and Labour : and if, as a result of this conflict, the numerous host of Labour eventually win, they will win by treating owners of Land as the people of Lilliput treated the broad-backed Gulliver, when they tied him to the ground and shot needles into every portion of his body, a proceeding which can scarce commend itself to a Nation of Sportsmen.

Now, I cannot see either wit, wisdom, or sport in this proceeding. Apart from its ultimate danger to the credit of the country, and its unsportsmanlike reliance on numbers, it is such a barbaric and unchristian way of doing good.

MR. LLOYD GEORGE AND WILLIAM THE CONQUEROR.

We are told that Mr. Lloyd George's device of selecting a single form of unearned increment for moral disapproval, and attempting to value wealth due to Humanity and Co. in the form of land near big towns, is equivalent to a second *Domesday Book*. But what scant faith Mr. Lloyd George and his School of Thought must have in the Christian principle, and in human nature generally, compared with that which was displayed by William the Conqueror and the Catholic-Feudal School of Thought, which was jointly responsible for the first *Domesday Book*. Mr. Lloyd George, I gather, dislikes both Dukes and Bishops. But if he and his friend—Mr. Winston Churchill—would, between them, shew even a quarter of the faith which was displayed by those alien immigrants Duke William of Normandy and Archbishop Lanfranc, in a barbarous and bloody age, a thousand years ago, there would be some chance of their new *Domesday* project succeeding.

Does Mr. Lloyd George really wish history to record that, when *a thousand years ago*, in a barbarous and bloody age, William the Conqueror crossed the English Channel, and, *for military purposes*, made a *Domesday Valuation* of the land, he had so much faith in human nature that part of his scheme of military government implied the voluntary endowment of the Church, to the tune, in the end, of one-third of the land. But that, when, a thousand years later, in the most benevolent century

in history—in the reign of Edward the Peacemaker—Mr. Lloyd George crossed the Severn—and, *for social purposes*—ordered a second Domesday Valuation to be made—faith in the voluntary generosity of his countrymen formed no part of his political baggage? Is history to record that Mr. Lloyd George and his colleagues were so wanting in kindness and faith that, to arrive, *not* at a military occupation of the country, but a juster distribution of social wealth—they made *no* appeals to chivalry, *no* appeals to good fellowship between class and class—but that the only Organization they could think of for effecting such infinitely delicate moral ends was “the State,” the Tax-collector, and the Policeman? Are Mr. Asquith, Sir Edward Grey, above all, Burke’s brilliant biographer, Lord Morley—merely to point the moral to Burke’s observation on the debaters of the French Revolution, when he said :—

“IT IS UNDOUBTEDLY TRUE, THOUGH IT MAY SEEM PARADOXICAL ; BUT IN GENERAL, THOSE WHO ARE HABITUALLY EMPLOYED IN FINDING AND DISPLAYING FAULTS ARE UNQUALIFIED FOR THE WORK OF REFORMATION, BECAUSE THEIR MINDS ARE NOT ONLY UNFURNISHED WITH PATTERNS OF THE FAIR AND GOOD, BUT BY HABIT THEY COME TO TAKE NO DELIGHT IN THE CONTEMPLATION OF THOSE THINGS. BY HATING VICES TOO MUCH, THEY COME TO LOVE MEN TOO LITTLE.”

If this is really so, then one is compelled, reluctantly, to submit that the School of Thought which all



these gentlemen have so recently joined, is, in so far as it relies upon Taxation, not a Christian School of Thought at all, and that a political Socialist is only another name for a Saracen. For this Mohammedan device of promoting morality by State-force is at total variance with the pacific policy of One of whom it was said that "a greater than Solomon is here." Nor do Mr. Lloyd George's methods merely compare unfavourably with those of the New Testament. His wisdom can scarce be said to be even the Old Testament wisdom of Solomon. It is suggestive rather of the statesmanship of Jeroboam, the Son of Nebat. For Mr. Lloyd George virtually declares:—

"My predecessors in Office made your yoke greivous, but I will add to your yoke: my predecessors chastised you with whips, but I will chastise you with scorpions."\*

Convinced of the sincerity of his desire to uplift the degraded, I cannot honestly suggest that Mr. Lloyd George, or the hasty young men to whom he has listened, can really, in their heart of hearts, mean all that their valuation policy must ultimately imply. And I cordially invite them to give careful thought to the following Neo-Catholic, and *non-party*, alternative to the Budget, in-so-far as the Budget attempts to deal with unearned increment by party force and appeals to class hatred.

---

\* "This is a fighting Budget."—LLOYD GEORGE.



A NEO-CATHOLIC ALTERNATIVE FOR DEALING WITH  
UNEARNED INCREMENT OF ALL KINDS.

For there are, I submit, three common-sense devices which would be helpful in dealing with unearned increment, whether in the form of land, capital, shares, or house property.

(1) The first remedy, which can be applied without, I think, any objection from any quarter, will be the establishment of a Neo-Catholic Institution, or Corporation, for social service, to which, as in the collective Middle Ages, wealthy persons can make voluntary bequests at death, or voluntary gifts during life, of both land and capital, shares and houses.

As we shall see in our next chapter, gifts of land and house-property will be used to make the Home the basis of Social Reform: while gifts of capital or shares will be used to moralize trade, on lines already indicated.

(2) The second remedy—to which, also, no objection is likely to be made—is, that all wealth now accruing to “the State” in the form of death duties, shall no longer be converted into coin for current expenses, but, so soon as our Neo-Catholic Corporation has secured the confidence of the country, be treated as capital, and used to capitalize the afore-said Corporation, to make it a Landlord and a Shareholder. And, as our Neo-Catholic Corporation will make large contributions towards National

Education, the Exchequer will be the gainer, rather than the loser, by this transaction.

(3) The third Neo-Catholic proposal will be too drastic to please extreme Individualists, and not drastic enough to please extreme Collectivists. It will perhaps, however, commend itself to the ordinary responsible citizen as a simple common-sense proposal, which offers possibilities of development, and can be introduced without any dislocation of industry, and appeal to the greed of the Electorate, or any costly and questionable attempt to discover the worth, for purposes of taxation, of a fluctuating value.

This proposal is one which concerns our present system of making wills. For, at present, a Testator bequeaths irresponsible share-property—or land increasing in value—to his children, his relations, or his friends, without making any stipulations as to the responsibilities which shall be undertaken by his heirs, as the terms they must obey, conditional to inheriting such “property.”

In this connection, I submit, that some—I do not say new law—but rather that some new custom should grow up among us, which should be advocated by our Neo-Catholic Corporation, by the Churches, and by political leaders of all parties. For, owing to the vast commercial “property” (in so many instances—as we have seen—the produce of Humanity and Co.) which now legally falls to individual heirs, and becomes legally “their own,”

to invest or spend, at home or abroad, as they please—a new question arises.

This question is, how far the present *legal right* of such persons to regard such property as exclusively their own, requires to be modified by a development of our customs, which will bring home to all heirs, that there are *moral duties* attaching to the ownership of “property” in the form of shares or house-property, as well as property in the more visible form of a landed estate in the country.

I submit—that is to say—that, in a Christian country, where men have consciences, and where there are sentiments of honour and chivalry, which can be aroused, what we want is for a Neo-Catholic Institution to point out to the man who has “made his pile” three irrefutable moral truths now ignored, from ignorance more largely than from selfishness.

(a) How largely his wealth is due to Humanity and Co., to social machinery, and to the moral achievements of mankind in the past.

(b) The absolutely irresponsible character of share-property.

(c) The demoralizing effect which “vast” inherited wealth will have upon his heirs unless it is accompanied by a correspondingly vast sense of responsibility as to use and investment.

Proceeding on such quiet and inoffensive lines, it is hardly too much to assume that, in such a Chris-

tian country as Britain really is, a Neo-Catholic Corporation, controlled by men whom all classes can respect, working on these lines, without any fractious legislation whatever, can secure, in the course of the next quarter of a century, from many a modern Father or Testator, the right to act as the Executor of the wealth, or a portion thereof, which he bequeaths to his heirs.\*

In other words, many a wealthy Father or Testator of to-day, who is bitterly opposed to House of Commons Socialism, or photographic valuations of movable values would, if he values the moral welfare of those to whom he makes bequests, and cares for the future of his country, be anything but averse to the idea of making a Neo-Catholic Corporation his Executor, and empowering it—within reasonable limits—to pay his heirs a minimum income, or a minimum portion of the capital, the amount beyond these *minima* to be at the discretion of the Neo-Catholic Corporation, which can be checked by “the State” and the Courts, if it acts arbitrarily.

By this means many a wastrel, whilst being provided for, would be prevented from squandering in riotous living, the whole of a fortune, none of it due to his own exertions, a portion of which, under the

---

\* The recently appointed Public Trustee has, I understand, very wide powers. But he is, after all, only in the position of an ordinary Executor. His duties are to pay the moneys over and ask no questions.



circumstances, might well be diverted by our Neo-Catholic Corporation, to such an object as National Education, and thereby justly relieve the overburdened middle class tax-payer.

By some such device, which must not be legally compulsory, many of the descendants of the wealthy would obtain the advantages of inherited wealth, but on the conditions that they fulfilled the corresponding duties of those who belong to the governing classes.

THE NUCLEUS FOR A NEO-CATHOLIC ALTERNATIVE TO THE BUDGET IS ALREADY IN EXISTENCE AND BRINGS IN MORE THAN MR. LLOYD GEORGE'S PROPOSALS.

But here we must pause. For a reader will perhaps say that the British Public will not leave legacies voluntarily to a Neo-Catholic Corporation, and that Mr. Lloyd George is, consequently, right in advocating State-force to compel them to "stump up."

If he really thinks that, I commend to his notice the following, from the list of voluntary charitable legacies for 1908, taken from Whitaker's Almanack for 1909. For we here meet the astounding fact that the first two of these legacies, alone, amount to more than double of all Mr. Lloyd George expects to get in the first year — viz., something over £400,000.



| Name of Testator.                                                        | Approx. amount<br>of Bequest. £ |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Mrs. Enriqueta Augustina Rylands, of<br>Manchester ... ..                | ... £600,000                    |
| Sir William George Pearce, 2nd Bart. ...                                 | 406,000                         |
| Robert Wilkinson Smith, of Nottingham ...                                | 293,000                         |
| Jane Louisa, Lady Brampton ...                                           | 250,000                         |
| Edward Aston, of Manchester ...                                          | 110,000                         |
| Michael Edward Sanderson, of Wakefield,<br>Maltster ... ..               | ... 110,000                     |
| Mrs. Anne Louisa Russel Waldo-Sibthorp,<br>of Hove .. ..                 | ... 80,000                      |
| John Briscoe, of Oxford, F.R.C.S. ...                                    | 67,000                          |
| John Campbell White, 1st Baron Overtoun,<br>Chemical Manufacturer ... .. | 61,200                          |
| Charles Edward Layton, of London, Stationer                              | 60,000                          |
| John Frederick Obree, of Southampton,<br>Shipping Agent ... ..           | 50,000                          |
| Richard Badger, of Leamington, retired<br>Wine Merchant ... ..           | 50,000                          |
| Deputy Alderman Robert William Edwards,<br>of London, Stationer ... ..   | 50,000                          |
| Basil McCrea, of Belfast, Contractor ...                                 | 50,000                          |
| Miss Emily Charlotte Ogilvie, of Bath ...                                | 50,000                          |

Now the above are merely the larger voluntary bequests for 1908. Suffice it to say that the whole totalled to £3,548,705 in that year. In 1907 similar bequests amounted to £4,868,050 or a little short of five millions : and in 1906 to £4,486,440.

Now, I would beg the reader to note that the above legacies are totally different from voluntary charitable subscriptions *given during life*; which

amount, as we shall see, in the next chapter, to a far vaster sum. These big voluntary legacies to the community are rather a recognition of the principle that unearned increment is owed to the community. And by their vastness they obviously declare the extent to which—without any Neo-Catholic campaign whatever—wealthy persons *already* recognise, *of their own free will*, the extent to which they owe their wealth to the Moral Principle, and that social machinery which we considered in Chapter VI.

We are, however, told that, though close on five millions per annum have been voluntarily bequeathed to the community, the best plan for assisting the degraded is not to quicken—by appeals to chivalry—these voluntary bequests, but use them scientifically. “Not at all,” cry these Socialistic Saracens, “take it by State-force from the blackmailing brutes!” or words to that effect.\*

---

\* As I am revising these pages, a writer in *Blackwood's Magazine* relates that a number of supporters left one of Mr. Asquith's meetings crying :—“We don't want your charity ; what we want is your money, and we're going to get it.”

It is perfectly true that the word “charity” has become synonymous with money given, often, in a patronising and offensive manner, and there is much truth in the familiar saying that, what the poor want is justice and not charity. The misuse of the word “charity” should not, however, prevent all classes from recognizing that money voluntarily given is better than money taken by State-force. In addition to this, those who want “justice” for the poor

AMPHITHEATRE DEVICES FOR PROMOTING SOCIAL  
WELL-BEING.

Mr. Runciman, the Liberal Financial Secretary to the Treasury, is an admirable exponent of this most "Progressive" ideal. He has recently explained to a fascinated audience that, to quote his exact words: "*the process of imposing the new taxes is as painful as the operation of extracting teeth. Mr. Lloyd George performs the part of dentist in a gentle and sympathetic manner* (laughter and cheers). *He (Mr. Lloyd George) has given those of whom the taxes*

---

ought fairly to remember that, in a country where the State policy is controlled by election appeals to the crowd, the working classes who "want justice" are themselves the judges. This was the weakness of the Athenian Constitution. It was controlled in the end by the Have-nots. The inefficient many controlled and lived on the efficient few. Hence Lord Beaconsfield has truly said :—

"By what plausible arguments were the dwellers of the Piræus admitted to vote in the Athenian Assembly? . . . Hence from that moment arose the dictator and the demagogue, . . . the flatterer, and the tyrant of mobs; hence, the rapid fluctuations, the greedy enterprises, the dominion of the Have-nots, the ruin of the fleet, the loss of the colonies, the thirty tyrants, the vain restoration of a hollow freedom . . . licence—corruption—servitude—dissolution. Give the popular Assembly of Great Britain up to the *controlling* influence of the *lowest* voters in large towns, and you have brought again a Piræus to destroy your Athens."

What is the conclusion? It is that the degraded are not to be the *judges* as to the question of a juster distribution of wealth. The only judge must be a really moral judge, in the form of a Neo-Catholic Church.

*are expected no anæsthetic, but has told them what is taking place boldly and honestly."*<sup>(a)</sup> (Loud cheers).

Apparently, though they have no faith in the Catholic-feudal principle of voluntary gifts to the Church, Mr. Runciman and his admirers are anxious to associate their up-to-date methods of doing good with those devices for pulling out teeth, in which the most brutal of feudal Barons occasionally indulged; or, as Calverly has it—

“ When by way of mild reminders  
That he needed coin, the Knight  
Day by day extracted ‘grinders’  
From the howling Israelite.”

Only, whereas this sublime dentistry was once practiced by the barbaric few in their dungeons, it is now, for social purposes, to be the open and ennobling “sport,” of the enfranchised many, on every “Roman holiday.” And I suppose that the next amphitheatre-cry of these pagan politicians will be “*the Landlords to the Lions!*”

Mr. Runciman describes Mr. Lloyd George’s methods as *bold and honest*, and in so doing, raises loud cheers. Well! I must confess that this kind of boldness is not the kind of boldness which appeals to me. The kind of boldness which—I venture to think—we want in this country is a boldness of faith in human nature, a boldness which goes on

---

<sup>(a)</sup> From a speech by Mr. Runciman at Carnarvon, on August 21st, 1909. (Quoted from the *Daily News* for August 30th).



the principle: "I never trust a gentleman by halves;" a boldness, in accordance with which, at the risk of being laughed at, the Neo-Catholic Social Wardens of the future shall not be afraid to sing to Britannia:

"If I could plant a tiny seed of love  
In the garden of your heart."

But this boldness which Mr. Runciman apparently admires in Mr. Lloyd George is—it is to be feared—the boldness which is bold because it relies on the ability of its owner to appeal successfully to the cupidity of the Crowd. It is the boldness of the man who is "inspired, but not from above."\* It is the boldness of the man who is bold because he has the Mob at his back. There was a time in Mr. Lloyd George's career when he displayed other qualities. There was a time when, whether rightly or wrongly, in championing the cause of the Boers, he defied the Mob at Birmingham, when, like Strafford, he threw down the gauntlet and refused to bend to a policy which he himself believed to be wrong. And for my part, I cannot but think that it is merely his hasty endeavour to act before he has thought, "to fly to the end without considering the means"—as Bacon has it—which is leading Mr. Lloyd George to display the kind of boldness which—if his Valuation scheme is really to raise, in course of time, those vast sums which are—I

---

\* Randolph Churchill.



frankly admit—unquestionably needed for Social Reform—can only be raised, under our Party system of Government, by the boldness of men who, like Cleon of Athens, are prepared to make class-hatred the car on which they ride into an unenviable notoriety, over the corpse of their Country's honour.

Let us now turn from these up-to-date amphitheatre tricks, to the business side of the question. For how much do these new taxes on unearned increment bring in, compared with the three, four, and five millions which have already come in annually as a result of those voluntary bequests which merely require to be used scientifically? In the first year, Mr. Asquith tells us, the earnings of our Liberal Dentists will amount to something over £400,000 sterling. In the second year a million. After this much more. At the same time, the plant which our Liberal Dentists have to lay down, before they can really get to business, is to cost us no less than two millions. Mr. Asquith asserts that, later on, the upkeep of their plant will not cost so much as at first. Well! that is a question to which I have already directed the attention of the reader. But, even if it is really possible (with the extremely rapid change in methods of transit, that is taking place every year in the region of our great towns), to effect any valuation of land near great towns, which will be valid for more than nine months: even granted that this is possible, the figures which I have already adduced, surely make it not unrea-

sonable to submit that a pacific and gentle Neo-Catholic campaign, dealing with unearned increment of all kinds, will bring into a Neo-Catholic Treasury, many more millions than are to be secured by Mr. Lloyd George's State devices, which neglect the speculator in anything and everything but land, in order to provoke a conflict with the House of Lords.

ARE WE TO WIDEN OR HEAL THE GULF BETWEEN  
RICH AND POOR.

In his principal speech in defence of the Budget, Sir Edward Grey has observed, that the question which the ordinary citizen will ask concerning these Budget proposals, is whether they are reasonable and just.

The question which I venture in return to ask Sir Edward is this. "Looking the situation fair and square in the face, is it not, Sir, true that every year a Neo-Catholic Corporation makes a sportsmanlike appeal for, and secures, voluntary bequests, or gifts, it will be healing the gulf which now yawns threateningly between rich and poor? But that, on the other hand, every year in which these State Valuers march about the country, and appeals are made to the hatred of the poor rather than the honour of the well-to-do, the gulf between rich and poor will widen? And is it not more reasonable to give the conciliatory policy a fair trial, before you advocate a policy which, though it may be made to

appear reasonable enough, on party platforms, is calculated in practice to widen, every year that it proceeds, the gulf between rich and poor; which is calculated, assuredly, to infuriate rather than to inspire. For of wealth given voluntarily, and used scientifically, it may truly be said that:—

“It blesseth him that gives and him that takes.”

While, on the other hand, of wealth taken as results of appeals to the hatred of the Crowd, it is not untrue to say that it is taken in spite and given grudgingly, and makes bad blood between men of the same race, who ought to be drawn nearer to each other, and made to feel that they are brothers. For though it may be made to appear reasonable, it can only be at the hands of men who possess that ability, which Milton describes as a peculiar characteristic of the devil, and which some would associate with the methods of those party politicians whom we are asked to regard as moral reformers—viz. the ability to

“make the worse appear  
The better reason.”

At the same time, let us frankly confess that Neo-Catholic methods of tackling the evil of unearned increment of all kinds through voluntary gifts and bequests, can only meet with success if all responsible Liberals and Conservatives in the country, agree to throw aside their party weapons, and lend a hearty support to the Neo-Catholic alternative of raising money for social ends by social means.

CENTRAL IDEA—THE HOUSE OF LORDS AND THE  
BUDGET, OR "PEACE WITH HONOUR."

I therefore venture to urge, that the sanest course for a practical people to pursue, is for the House of Lords boldly to reject those sections of the Budget which deal with attempts to value unearned increment, in the form of land values, and, as an alternative *likely to win both the support and respect of both parties in the country*—if not in the House of Commons—that the House of Lords assists the Church to establish a Neo-Catholic Institution, to which unearned increment, in the form of Protectionist Monopolies, as well as unearned increment in the form of Land-values, can voluntarily be bequeathed; and to which, also, voluntary bequests of shares and houses can voluntarily be made during life or at death.

If, in addition to this, it is conceded to Liberalism—as has been half recommended by the Lords themselves\*—that certain members of the Non-conformist Churches (possibly all ex-Chairmen of the Free Church Federation), shall sit side-by-side with the Bishops, as Neo-Catholics, in the Upper House, many of the *desiderata* for a better social understanding between rival religious communities, as well as rival political parties, in the country, will simultaneously have been secured.

---

\* See the recent Report issued by a Committee of the Peers as to the Reform of the Upper House.



Now, this suggestion, I submit, embodies the principle of "Peace with Honour." In accordance with this policy, Liberals will not be allowed to adopt their present amphitheatre devices for dealing with unearned increment. But the House of Lords will have conceded to them the principle that unearned increment is morally indefensible, and they will have won a moral victory.

At the same time, from a Liberal point of view, the sting will have been taken out of Tariff Reform, on lines which will, I venture to think, also commend itself to those Conservatives who believe in Tariff Reform, but are not blind to the evils of Protectionist Monopolies. For, in accordance with the above proposals, Tariff Reform will be introduced into the country on Neo-Catholic lines which will moralize it from the start, in a way that it has not been moralized in America.

In other words, Conservatives will have conceded to Liberals, that Tariff Reform is not an alternative to those clauses of the Budget which deal with unearned increment. For the truth is, that the Nation as a whole, wants Tariff Reform, but also wants the question of unearned increment to be tackled, but both in a statesmanlike manner. And the Nation is in this dilemma, that Tariff Reform, while it offers an alternative method of raising money for State purposes, offers no alternative for dealing with the vast moral evil associated with unearned increment of all kinds. Nay, unless Tariff Reform is moralized,



on the lines indicated, it will create fresh unearned increment, in the shape of monopoly profits of a kind every whit as questionable as unearned increment in land.

It follows that, if the House of Lords rejects the Budget, and the Conservative Party wins the next election on Tariff Reform, but offers the Nation no *alternative* Neo-Catholic scheme for dealing with unearned increment, on voluntary social lines—at the end of seven years Mr. Balfour's next Administration will go the way of Mr. Balfour's last Administration: and there will arise an attempt to value Protectionist as well as Landed Increment, an attempt of a far more fanatical kind than the present one.

In other words, the Tory Party must drop its present device of sitting on a fence and humming "Wait till the clouds roll by, Jenny." It must exercise foresight. It must be capable of creating a Neo-Catholic Corporation, to effect social development, while, through the State, it gives the Nation the rest, stability, and confidence, which the Nation wants.

Provided, therefore, that the Lords, and those Conservative forces in the country who are advocating Protection, make what is really an immense moral concession by supporting the establishment of a Neo-Catholic Corporation, for receiving voluntary gifts of unearned increment, the Lords will unquestionably have both the Electorate and the

Churches at their back, if they boldly throw out the land clauses of the Budget. By assisting to establish a Neo-Catholic Corporation, they will, moreover, assign positive, and not merely negative, functions to the Upper House, and they will establish that highly desirable end of Twentieth - Century State-craft, viz., a Partnership between the Peers and the People.

But here a reader will observe, "But has the House of Lords the right to throw out a Money Bill?"

Well, Sir, the question, surely, is *not* whether the House of Lords has the right to throw out a Money Bill, but whether the Budget is a Money Bill in the ordinary sense of the word. For the truth surely is, that it contains an attempt to establish new Bureaucratic Machinery for social ends. And what, in no party spirit, I venture to demur is, that we have, for all our short-comings, reached a pitch of civilization when all the ends desired by those who would tax unearned increment, can be better secured by means of social Neo-Catholic Machinery, and Love, rather than by bureaucratic State Machinery and Force. What I cordially urge is, that we should give the principle of Neo-Catholic Love a chance, before we resort to State force, and try modernized Catholic means for uplifting the degraded, before we revert to what are really Roman and Athenian ones. Nay, in one of his recent essays, Lord Morley has himself declared

that certain recent measures to do good through the State, on socialistic lines, are Byzantine in character.

It is the peculiar genius of the British Constitution, that it is not fixed. At a crisis it relies upon our sturdy common-sense as a people. At an emergency it recognises the sublime truth embalmed by Longfellow, when he sang how—

“Before man made us citizens,  
Great Nature made us men,”

and it is, I venture to submit, by appeals to our humanity, and to that love of childhood which to-day animates all classes, that we must look for constitutional progress, rather than to legal precedence, to guide us in this great matter.

THESE PAGES ARE NOT INTENDED TO IMPLY AN ATTACK ON MR. LLOYD GEORGE, BUT MERELY TO SUGGEST AN ALTERNATIVE AND SOCIAL METHOD FOR DEALING WITH UNEARNED INCREMENT.

And now, may I trespass on the reader's time for a moment, to make it quite clear that anyone is suffering from a delusion if he supposes that, in the above reference to Mr. Lloyd George, and his Budget, the writer implies a party attack upon him and his political allies. It is, alas! unfortunate that Mr. Lloyd George—still more Mr. Churchill—should have rushed forward with such warm-hearted impetuosity, to remedy what are essentially moral ills, so entirely unacquainted with those Institutions and Principles which have made most for moral progress

in the past. It was, therefore, vital that, in the interests of social peace, an attempt should be made to supply their ardent hands with gentle but effective foils, in place of the party darts which they were using in the arena against perplexed John Bull. At the same time one cannot hold it wholly amiss that Mr. Lloyd George, and his friends, should have laid such abnormal stress on unearned increment, as to threaten this valuation. And those who value the Neo-Catholic principles advocated in these pages, will agree that, at the fag-end of the Cromwellian Epoch, with no Neo-Catholic light to guide him, it was extremely pardonable that Mr. Lloyd George should—to adopt a different metaphor—have launched a Budget which resembled the lugubrious craft described by Milton, which was

“Built in eclipse and rigged with curses dark.”

COMPARISON BETWEEN SOCIALISTIC LIBERALS, AND THE GENTLEMEN ADVENTURERS IN ROBERT LOUIS STEVENSON'S “TREASURE ISLAND.”

One might illustrate this point by suggesting that Mr. Lloyd George, for all his dislike for Squires and Parsons, is really amazingly like that hot-headed Squire, Trelawny, in Robert Louis Stevenson's *Treasure Island*. He sees in unearned increment a vast ill-gotten treasure which he wants to get somehow. But he is in such a desperate haste to set sail, that he makes no attempt carefully to think out his plan of campaign in the study, before he weighs anchor. And as Squire Trelawny set sail in



quest of the Buccaneers' hoard, with a crew who were, half of them, buccaneers themselves, so too, Mr. Lloyd George proposes to go in quest of unearned increment, without taking the remotest trouble to pick his crew. For he does not take a carefully-sifted altruistic crew to capture unearned increment for the community. On the contrary, he goes down to the port of Limehouse, as Squire Trelawny went to Bristol, and makes his appeals couched in language calculated to secure him as followers, all those in the country who are discontented; all who bear social jealousy and malice against the owners of land; all, in a word, who, from both their education and their environment, require rather to be uplifted and disciplined by a Neo-Catholic Corporation, than to be themselves the moral arbitrators on the question of a juster distribution of wealth. And, for my part, as I remember the result which followed on the hot and hasty action of Squire Trelawny, in selecting his followers: as I remember how *Ben Gunn*, who may be perhaps compared to the *Man in the Street*, blew away his money the moment he got it, and how *John Silver*, who may perhaps be compared to the *Land Valuers* and the *Lawyers* (because he kept in with both parties, and bled them both), ran off with such an abnormal share of the proceeds at the end—as I reflect, I say, upon these things, I cannot but feel sure that the same fate awaits him who would settle the question of a juster distribution of wealth, without a carefully-thought-out plan of campaign, and a carefully selected crew.



There is, however, this important difference between the attempt made by Squire Trelawny and that of Mr. Lloyd George, which we must now note. Squire Trelawny found *Treasure Island* unoccupied, save by a solitary seaman and a few sea-birds. On the other hand, Mr. Lloyd George and his crew find the *Treasure Island*, where unearned increment lies, defended, not merely by the Budget Protest League, and the Tariff Reform League, but by more than half the newspapers in the country, and by the prejudice of three Protestant centuries.

“One moment!” cries a reader, “then you admit that unearned increment represents ill-gotten gains?”

Of course! All financial transactions, and not merely those dealing with land, have, since the Reformation, been tinged with an excessive selfishness. We have, for centuries, godlessly worshipped individualistic money-making; and Shakespeare was surely right when, at the opening of the Protestant Epoch, he wrote:—

“How quickly nature falls into revolt,  
When gold becomes her object!  
For this the foolish over-careful fathers  
Have broke their sleep with thoughts,  
    their brains with care,  
Their bones with industry;  
For this they have engross'd and piled up  
The canker'd heaps of strange achieved gold.”

But, because this is so, there is no need for us to lose our heads in our attempts to create corporate

property. On the contrary, the more civilized a Nation is, the more tactful and pacific should be the devices whereby it bridges over the gulf between an Individualistic and a Neo-Catholic civilization.

THE NEED FOR COOL SCIENTIFIC REFORMS  
AT HOME AMONG A  
NATION WITH VAST EASTERN RESPONSIBILITIES.

We are now intelligent enough to see the folly of those Protestants who, at the Reformation, burnt Catholics at the stake. *We ought, in consequence, to recognise the unscientific stupidity of any attempt to visit upon the heads of a single generation of existing wealthy persons to-day, the economic sins of three Protestant centuries.*

For abnormally wealthy persons to-day are the children of three centuries, during which an individual and anti-corporate principle has prevailed. And far from assuming to ourselves the functions of an Old Testament conception of Heaven, and visiting the sins of the fathers upon the children, such poor wisdom as we mortals possess, must surely display itself in our ability to reject, as unworthy of our enlightened age, those fanatical methods which accompanied the attempts of our ancestors to reform, in unenlightened ages, when no one could read.

At a recent meeting in a Music Hall at Leicester on a Saturday afternoon, Mr. Churchill addressed a crowded audience of four thousand persons on the topic of the Budget.

“What I want to draw your attention to,” said Mr. Churchill, “is the appalling lack of anything like a leader or a spokesman on the Tory side who is capable of commanding public attention, or conducting adequately this great controversy and debate upon which we are now engaged. . . In the absence of anything popular and effective, in the absence of any commanding voice, the Tory Party have to fall back upon their dukes (laughter). They have had to put up their dooks. (A voice: ‘What about your grandfather?’—and other voices: ‘Burn him!’).—From *Daily Telegraph* report, Sept. 6th, 1909.

Whether it was Mr. Churchill or his ducal ancestor whom a section of that Music Hall audience wished to burn, I am not quite clear; I presume it was the latter. But if this is to be the kind of language which is uttered at meetings where Cabinet Ministers are the chief speakers, what will be the language used by State Reformers in the street? And am I so wrong in submitting that the commanding voice for which, not merely the Tory Party, but all responsible Liberals, are waiting is the impartial voice of the Church, and not the voice of any “popular” and “effective” politician. And I shall shortly show that this is the opinion, not merely of a Tory student of statecraft, but of such a respected Nonconformist as the Rev. J. H. Jowett, of Birmingham.

But more than this. If the British people cannot settle the question of a juster distribution of wealth

at home, on cool scientific lines, how can they hope to retain the respect of the peoples of India and Egypt? Our duties towards the East are increasing in gravity every year. And it is only by assuaging party differences here, and adopting conciliatory methods of reform at home, that we shall be in a position to cope with Eastern responsibilities abroad.

It follows that if we would recreate corporate Catholic property we must treat the existing generation of abnormally wealthy persons as we should like, ourselves, to be treated, if we were in their position, and possessed their prejudices.

IF THE LORDS PASS THE BUDGET UNEARNED INCREMENT  
WILL ONLY TAKE A DIFFERENT FORM.

And now let us suppose that Mr. Lloyd George, Mr. Winston Churchill, and their State Socialist friends hustle the House of Lords into passing this "popular" and "effective" measure for dealing with unearned increment as regards land. Will their costly State machinery bring us a whit nearer solving the problem of unearned increment as a whole?

Not a bit of it. Unearned increment will merely take a different shape. This political and party method of dealing with a moral evil will only lead to party reprisals. And for every penny of *Landed Increment* their State valuers collect from the wealthy classes as a whole, the wealthy classes as a whole will get back a penny (if not twopence) in the form of *Protectionist Increment*.



Now, it is my misfortune that, on lines already adduced, I most strongly advocate Protection as a step necessary to the moralization of industry and the creation of variety of Employment. But only, as I have *most fully* insisted, conditional to the establishment of a Neo-Catholic Corporation to which Protectionist unearned increment can be voluntarily bequeathed.

To sum up, the net result of all Mr. Churchill's "popular" and "effective" speeches will be that he has had a smack at his ducal relations.

But perhaps Mr. Churchill will say that he has it in his Napoleonic mind to establish a second set of State Valuers to deal with forms of unearned income other than land.

In that case one can only say that the figures adduced, in the present chapter and the next, support the view that bold appeals to honour and self-sacrifice will settle the question of unearned increment in a manner that Mr. Churchill's appeals to party spite, and Mr. Runciman's amphitheatre "turns" will never do, and that, with the fullest claims to the gratitude of his fellow-countrymen for bringing the question of unearned increment into such deserved prominence, Mr. Lloyd George and his gallant young aide-de-camps can accept the principle of Peace with Honour without any stain on the Liberal Flag.

For the truth surely is that the only wisdom which will settle the question of unearned increment, must



be the wisdom of a Church which can ask all classes to make sacrifices in a way that "popular" and "effective" politicians cannot.

THE CHILDREN AND "TREASURE ISLAND," OR  
"PETER PAN" *versus* THE POLITICIANS.

To sum up, the wisdom of the ages surely tells us that if the children set sail for that *Treasure Island* where unearned increment of all kinds now lies, defended by the prejudice of three anti-Corporate Protestant centuries—they will be more successful in assisting us to establish Corporate Neo-Catholic property and solve the social problem than will "swash-buckling" political buccaneers, and paid electioneering agents. And, as on a Christmas morning, two thousand years ago, the wisdom of the East was led by a Star to the cradle of a little child, so too, to-day, beneath Western heavens, all who would really lead the Nation must cease from attempting—like Naaman, the Syrian—to do "great things," and quietly direct the attention of all classes to the divine claims of the cradle.

For it is, in the main, for the benefit of our children, and of our grandchildren, that we, of this generation, require to re-establish corporate property. And if we will but steadily, day-by-day, keep the welfare of the children uppermost in our minds, we shall assuredly find that Peace and goodwill, to an increasing extent, animate men of all classes and all creeds.

## SUMMARY OF CHAPTERS VII. AND VIII.

(or The Church as Shareholder, concluded).

It will, doubtless, be urged that the suggestions in this and the preceding chapter, as to the moralizing of trade and legacies, are somewhat indeterminate in character, and that I have given the barest details as to what our Neo-Catholic Corporation, as Shareholder, would do with her wealth. I have, however, purposely avoided drawing any alluring picture of the vast social and educational functions which could, manifestly, be undertaken by a Neo-Catholic Corporation, which was a Shareholder—but not a Manager in industry—and of the functions of such a Corporation as regards both the Food Question and the Drink Question. For, I would urge that our Neo-Catholic Corporation must tackle the gravest of our problems first, and make the Home the basis of Social Reform, before it endeavours to become a Shareholder and moralize trade.

## AN ANSWER TO THE "SHARP" BUSINESS MAN.

Before turning to the functions of the Church as Landlord, I should, however, like to answer an objection which will, doubtless, be made to the idea that a Neo-Catholic Corporation should hold shares bequeathed to it in commercial undertakings. For I can imagine a "sharp" business man saying:—

"I don't want your Lay-controlled Catholic Corporation — your Parsons — or your Neo-Catholic

Social Wardens poking their noses into my Company, and interfering between myself and my employees."

I feel sure, however, that, when the country has had time fully to reflect, such sharp men will be in the minority. For, whilst it would remonstrate against abnormally high dividends at the expense of employees' wages, our Neo-Catholic Institution would have a very strong interest in obtaining good reasonable dividends, which it would devote to vastly improving our whole conception of Education, and to moralizing the Drink Traffic. In addition to this its influence would make always for peace. Ask the Manager of any of our great Industrial Concerns of the present time what his greatest anxiety is, and he will tell you that, owing to the elimination of the old personal element, the relations between Capital and Labour have changed, and that the difficulty of making large dividends to satisfy hungry shareholders on the one hand, and of paying the higher wages demanded by employees on the other, are becoming every year more intolerable. Would not such a Manager welcome, rather than resent, the moderating influence, on Shareholders and workmen alike, which would enter with the acquisition of shares by a Neo-Catholic Corporation, controlled by Churchmen whom all classes could respect?

The same sharp man will perhaps urge: "Yes, that is all very fine; but how on earth will your

Neo-Catholic Institution or Corporation acquire, in course of time, both locally and nationally, enough interest, as Shareholder, in the industries of this country, to make her power really worth considering?"

Well! that is a question which I have already endeavoured to answer. But for my part I decline to believe that wealthy persons in this country are so hopelessly selfish as is always assumed. On the contrary, I am convinced that the vast sums which—as we have seen—many such persons now give away voluntarily, would be vastly increased if there existed such a Neo-Catholic Institution as I have indicated, to discipline rather than pauperize.

#### PECULIAR ADVANTAGE OF A CORPORATION OWNING SHARES.

But more than this. I would further urge that there are an increasing number of men whose wealth consists very largely in shares held in industrial and other concerns, which have been built up—to a considerable extent—by their own energy. Such men would surely be far more disposed to make gifts, or leave legacies, to the community, if they could do so without throwing shares on the market, and consequently depressing the value of those they still elect to hold, or leave to their descendants. And it is, among other things, to meet the needs of such men that the suggestion as to making the Church a *Shareholder* has been made.



## IS THE PROPOSAL TOO NOVEL IN CHARACTER?

Lastly, there are doubtless many who will feel that the proposals set forth are too novel in character and who would have things remain as they are. To such persons I would submit that some organic development—along more moral lines—of existing business customs, is inevitable. But it must be a change in our customs, and our characters rather than our laws. John Bull no more wants a horde of State Valuers to goad him into altruism than he wants to invite a Dancing Dervish into his wife's drawing-room in order to crush a black-beetle. He can be generous enough quite well himself, if he will only make up his mind.

Nothing, I would urge, is more marvellous than the vast changes which have taken place in the customs of the people of this country. During the course of centuries we have ever been ready to learn new lessons, and develop old Institutions to meet new needs. The Flemings taught us how to weave. We learnt our Banking methods from the Dutch. It was a Norman—Lanfranc—who laid the legal basis of our land-owning mediæval Church. We have never been too proud to learn from other countries, or from our own past, how best we can develop old Institutions to meet new needs. But, if there is to be effected in this country any great change in our habits and customs, in regard to the use and bequeathing of unearned increment : if the day is ever to come—and I am disposed to think



that it is not improbable—when a Neo-Catholic Institution, whose finances are controlled jointly by Laity and Clergy—shall be the biggest Householder and the biggest Shareholder in the Empire, that change will assuredly come about, *not*, as the result of any drastic methods of quasi-revolutionary “State” legislation, whatever.

HE THAT BELIEVETH SHALL NOT MAKE HASTE, AND WHAT WE REQUIRE IS A CHANGE IN OUR CUSTOMS AND CHARACTERS RATHER THAN OUR LAWS.

On the contrary, it will come, as all great and beneficent changes have come in the past, slowly and by degrees—as the result of the generosity and self-sacrifice, first of one great Capitalist, or Landowner, and then of others who will follow his public-spirited example. It will come as a result of all classes in the country keeping their heads, and displaying that animated moderation, that sound common-sense, and that keen sense of the ridiculous which has been one of the main causes of our success as a people hitherto. For while keen, we know when to pull up, whenever we see either ourselves or anyone else going beyond the line of practical common-sense. In a word, it will come as the result of all classes recognising, that, though we want a Neo-Catholic Corporation holding common property, that Corporation, before it becomes efficient in every town and county and village, will require as much training as a football team, and will only carry out its work

efficiently if the Crowd does not expect too much of it when it is playing its first matches. On the contrary, it will succeed if the Crowd learns, to an increasing extent, to play at Neo-Catholic football also. And what does Neo-Catholic football imply? It implies that we must keep our tempers, that we must preserve a cool head, that we must, above all things, remember that life in a civilized community is such that, if we mean to win, we must play together.

## CHAPTER IX.

## THE CHURCH AS LANDLORD :

OR,

## THE HOME THE BASIS OF SOCIAL REFORM.

“ Her court was pure ; her life serene ;  
 God gave her peace ; her land reposed ;  
 A thousand claims to reverence closed  
 In her as Mother, Wife, and Queen :

“ And statesmen at her council met  
 Who knew the season when to take  
 Occasion by the hand, and make  
 The bounds of freedom wider yet.

“ By shaping some august decree,  
 Which kept her throne unshaken still,  
 Broad-based upon her people’s will,  
 And compassed by the inviolate sea.”—

QUEEN VICTORIA, by *Tennyson*.

And now, having suggested what are—it is to be feared—very inadequate considerations as to the moralizing of trade and legacies, let us turn to the simpler though more important half of our Neo-Catholic proposals. For no current interest in Budget proposals must blind us from remembering—coolly—that the proposals in these pages which concern the Home, are far and away the most important element in the volume.

Their basis assumes that the Church must become a Landlord; and, by exercising a common-sense jurisdiction over her tenants, solve the Housing Problem, and make the Home the basis of Social Reform, and National regeneration.

THE PROPOSAL THAT THE CHURCH SHOULD BECOME A LANDLORD MUST NOT BE CARRIED TO FANTASTIC EXTREMES.

Now, whenever a new proposal is put forward, there are always a number of "enthusiasts" who rush forward and indulge in dreamy speculations which bring a new movement into just discredit with practical people. There arise also a host of no less hasty theorists, who, by selecting a single aspect of some many-sided proposal, and extending it to what they, illogically, call its logical conclusion, endeavour, inconclusively, to prove that the whole is ridiculous.

May I, therefore, save the Neo-Catholic scheme, which I am submitting, from both these classes, by making it clear, from the start, that it is not suggested, for an instant, that our Neo-Catholic Corporation should become everybody's Landlord, or anything approaching it. The point urged is rather that, in the present degraded state of a section of our citizens, there can be no real social reform until a Neo-Catholic Corporation is in a position to exercise a minimum moral authority over its tenants. At the same time, the present manner in which many wealthy persons, in every

town, or in towns where there are few or no poor (such as Bournemouth, Cheltenham, or Harrogate) ignore their responsibilities towards the "East End" of our great industrial towns, is such that nothing can be done until a really National Church has aroused their consciences, and brought a wholesome moral discipline to bear upon them also.

It cannot, indeed, be repeated too often that one of our chief needs is common-sense discipline, and that it is the moral and disciplinary character of Neo-Catholicism, which erects a barrier, as broad as the Atlantic, between Catholic Collectivism (controlled by the clergy and by Social Wardens elected by the Altruists of the Nation)—and political Socialism controlled by appeals to the self-interest of the Crowd, advocated by paid electioneering agents and by all the materialistic paraphernalia of the political *Caucus*.

#### MORALITY AND THE RENT OF WORKING-CLASS DWELLINGS.

Now, one of the chief economic evils of modern life is that, since the Reformation, our morality, in regard to house-rents, instead of improving with our advance in wealth and intelligence, has gone back. For house-rents have, now-a-days, become commercialized: and the price which, in our dense cities, a Briton pays for his home bears no righteous relation to the size of his weekly income. Nor do any Catholic considerations come into play, at all, as regards



the quality of the house, except certain crude sanitary regulations.

The truth indeed is that, in practically all our cities, a section among our wage-earners, who receive the smallest wages, or who, through no fault of their own, are engaged in casual forms of labour, find, when their scanty earnings do come in, that they have to pay—in many instances—twice as much, relative to the size of their incomes, as upper or middle-class folk, or prosperous artisans.

In far too many instances, the poor townsman earning a pound, eighteen shillings, or less, per week, has to pay four or five shillings for a slum house or a single room, where he and his family live. This is equivalent to a man with an income of £5,000 a year spending £1,250 per annum, for his house; to a man with an income of £500 a year paying £125; for a man possessing £250 a year paying £62 10s.; or for a miner earning £3 per week paying fifteen shillings a week in rent; a thing which neither of these classes would dream, for an instant, of doing.

Now the position of such persons is surely monstrously unjust. To the reader with plenty of money in his pocket five-shillings a week means nothing. But to a working man or a factory girl earning ten, fifteen, eighteen shillings or a pound a week, four or five shillings means fifteen jolly good dinners at four-pence per meal. And the difference of half-a-

crown, two-shillings, or even a shilling, in rent, means just the difference whether or not a man goes to work with a decent breakfast and a good heart, or whether he starts the day feeling that life is so wretched that he can only slink through it *somehow*.

CHRISTIAN TACT RATHER THAN POLITICAL SPITE  
NECESSARY IN DEALING WITH THIS GREAT EVIL.

While this is so, it ought clearly to be recognised that it is only during the last quarter of a century that Science has taught us fully to recognise the close relations which exist between air—light—and health. It cannot really be said that—save for the beautiful old monasteries—the notion of creating the highest environment for all classes, ever occurred to the Nation: it being to create such an environment that we need a Neo-Catholic Corporation.

From this it surely follows that we must not be unduly hard on speculative builders and their descendants, or on owners of unearned increment, who inherit the tradition of treating house-rents as a commercial and not a moral concern. Far from hastily abusing them, we should recognise that they are, to a large extent, merely the inheritors of an unscientific tradition.

It follows that we should endeavour to lay the situation before them, as we should like them to lay the situation before us; with tact and courtesy. They are human, and he is manifestly unjust who, without the fullest proof, treats another fellow-

Briton as if he were utterly devoid of civic patriotism, merely because he follows a Protestant tradition in regard to rents, and cannot easily assimilate himself to the needs of his age.

IT IS AS NECESSARY FOR ALL CLASSES IN THE NATION TO BE EFFICIENTLY HOUSED, AT RIGHTEOUS RENTS, AS IT IS FOR THEM TO POSSESS A PURE WATER-SUPPLY.

That some change in our customs, in the matter of housing and rent, is inevitable must, however, be manifest to all who value the industrial efficiency of the modern town worker, quite apart from business morality. For, while it is true that, under natural conditions, native races, such as the Kaffir or the Basuto, display remarkable qualities of physical endurance, and, at the same time—chiefs and people alike—spend their nights in crowded huts, where overcrowding is as marked as in some of our slums, the quasi-animal open-air lives which such races live, do not subject them to a tenth of the wear and tear of our modern city life. The Kaffir is not subjected, as is the modern townsman, to the ceaseless din of traffic, etc., which goes on during the greater part of both the day and the night in our great towns. The Kaffir boy or girl, who is full-grown physically (as was the mediæval Briton) at fourteen, is not able to read and write. He has not—that is to say—been subjected to that compulsory mental discipline and tuition which, if it is not to be injurious to children should only be given to those

whose housing, food, and training, have fitted them for standing what is, in a greater or less degree, the "strain" of all forms of mental activity.

The truth surely is, that the strain to which, almost from birth, the child born in or near a noisy town, is subjected, and the comparative flexibility of mind which he is expected to show, are such that there is a unique need that Society should create for him the best physical environment possible. So long as you allow him to grow up a comparative barbarian, destined to lead a quasi-animal existence, as<sup>3</sup> digger of the soil, so long will his physique remain comparatively unimpaired by the fact that he sleeps in a crowded bedroom, or that his home is situated in a sunless alley. When, however, you see a Nation transformed from an agricultural into an urban people, when work begins at 7, 8, or 9 a.m., instead of at sunrise, and business operations are carried on in the comparatively vitiated air of office or factory: when that work implies comparatively arduous, nervous, and not merely physical application, looking after accounts, or rapidly-moving machinery, why then an abundant supply of fresh air is necessary for the modern worker; not merely when he is going to and fro from his work, or on Saturdays or Sundays, but also when he is asleep. For, under town conditions, the freshness of the air breathed at night, and at early dawn, becomes a matter of life or death from the point of view of industrial and civic efficiency.



WHAT WE MUST DO TO GUARANTEE NORMAL HEALTH  
UNDER URBAN CONDITIONS.

It follows that, if the modern worker is to keep fit in our great towns, we must, in all our schools, teach both girls and boys to take a pride in being physically fit, and in using leisure wisely. We must follow up physical and intellectual training at school with some form of physical and moral supervision, till the age of twenty-one. We must guarantee that all classes live in efficient houses, under conditions whereby, during the night and early morning, the indifferent town air they have to breathe is not further vitiated by the evil results of overcrowding. They must have baths in their homes; and must be taught, from youth, to use them. There must be gardens and green open spaces in close proximity to every working man's home. And if this implies a carefully-planned development in the suburbs of every big industrial town, and the destruction, in their centres, of crowded mid-Victorian dwellings, to create fresh open spaces, these big tasks must be all achieved.

*But*, and this is my point, these schemes for vastly improving the character of a working man's home imply such heavy expenditure that they must not be achieved by spiteful taxation, or by the Nation organized for taxing the rich through "the State" or the Municipality. On the contrary, they must be achieved by bold faith in benevolence, by the Nation as organized for Love, and for Duty: as organized



—that is to say—through a Neo-Catholic Corporation, to which superfluous wealth, land and capital can be voluntarily bequeathed.

And this step, I say, is one which a recognition of the present state of the Nation's physique commands us imperiously to take. For it is the Nation with the "smiling morning face," blending the freshness of the savage with the sense of duty, the knowledge, and the moral courage of Civilization, which wins. We have hitherto led Humanity—in constitutional matters—largely because we have been an open-air race, fond of games, and learning from them

"The self-control which makes and keeps a Nation free."

If we are to continue true to our heritage we must give the Nation a chance of continuing this tradition.

TO SOLVE THE HOUSING PROBLEM WE MUST DEVOTE AN INCREASING PROPORTION OF THE MILLIONS NOW WASTED ON CHARITIES TO THE PURCHASE, OR ERECTION, OF HOUSE-PROPERTY.

What Neo-Catholic steps then, are we to take, if we are really to do justice in this matter? First, we must ask, what are our resources; second, we must consider what is our best method of utilizing them.

What, then, are our resources? Our resources consist of new voluntary gifts of houses and land, and of the money now wasted on over-lapping, and often pauperizing, charities. What the annual amount voluntarily given, on these lines, amounts to

it is impossible to ascertain, with any degree of accuracy. Official reports have recently shewn that London charities, alone, amount to £10,000,000 per annum, and, assuming that London is the centre to which many Provincial persons send charitable subscriptions, we shall be on the safe side if we assume that our annual voluntary gifts to charities etc. amount merely to £30,000,000 per annum, though possibly double that sum would be nearer the truth, as there can be no record or estimate of the millions given in the street, and by inexperienced Lady Bountifuls at the back-door. This is surely no exaggeration, for it has been estimated that we spend annually on sport some £40,000,000 out of a total annual income of £1,750,000,000.

Now, it is unanimously agreed, that our charities ought to work together, etc. In practice, however, it is far from easy to arrive at a common line of action, which implies that all existing charities will continue to exist. And the only method by which our Neo-Catholic Institution will be able to stop the public from draining the lake of our social misery with ten thousand teacups, rather than with a single efficient hose, must surely be a carefully-thought-out scheme for making benevolence scientific.

In other words, wealth voluntarily given, or bequeathed, for social objects must not, as at present, be all blown away in current expenses to atone to the poorest of the poor for the fact that their rents are abnormally high, and their wages abnormally

low. By doing that we merely aggravate the evil. For both Landlords and Employers of the careless type know that, if they pay abnormally low wages, or charge unjustly high rents, charity will prevent their tenants or employees from going utterly to the dogs, by free gifts of food, clothes, etc., to atone to them for their high rents and low wages.

What we want, surely, to do with an increasing proportion of the money voluntarily given every year, is to devote it to making the Church a House-owner, and, later on, a Share-owner. For in these two capacities, the Church will be able to work towards guaranteeing just rents and decent wages to every British citizen, and setting all other Landlords and Shareholders an example which they will learn to follow. Then there will be no need for these doles in lieu of wages or to atone for high rents.

#### FOLLY OF EXISTING CHARITIES.

That some such change is highly desirable must, surely, commend itself to the thoughtful. For our present charities, whatever they may pretend to do, are, too many of them, acting on the lines of the crude socialistic song, which runs :—

“Let’s call all the quids in  
And share and share alike ;  
Pile ’em all up in Trafalgar Square,  
So everybody can have his share.  
And, when we all have feasted  
On oysters and champagne,  
Let’s call all the quids in, boys  
And share ’em all out again !”

On a less lavish scale this is, indeed, precisely what the bulk of our charities are doing! They are sharing out, every year, as we have seen, £30,000,000 or more, among the poor, to atone to them for their abnormally high rents or low wages. But, when the year is over, and you ask what has been done, the only answer that the average Charity can give you is,—*Oh! we have called in so much money, shared it out, and next year we are going to do the same; only what we want is more money!*

On the contrary, I venture to submit that what we want is not, so much, more money, as more mind in disposing of it. What we surely want is a scientific attempt to divert charitable gifts and voluntary endowments (which are now largely wasted because they are given to atone—by means of doles—to the poorest of the poor, for their abnormally high rents, or low wages) into a single workmanlike attempt to erect new working-class homes, at selected sites, in the suburbs of our great cities, and to the purchase, at fair valuation, of already existing streets, on lines which will make a Neo-Catholic Corporation a Landlord.

#### FOUR ADVANTAGES OF A NEO-CATHOLIC CORPORATION WHICH OWNS HOUSE PROPERTY.

There are four notable advantages in proceeding on these lines.

I. If our Neo-Catholic Institution spends its money in purchasing, or erecting, homes, it is—unlike



our charities, which spend their millions on casual *current* expenses—getting at any rate, something for its money. It may lose something in creating open spaces, or in reducing a man's rent—to take a concrete instance, from five-and-six to three-and-six. But it still has an income of three and-six a week, or £9 2s. per annum, coming in from the property. And with this income, multiplied, as it would be, according to the number of houses acquired or erected, it can acquire further property. For it cannot be emphasised too fully that capitalized endowments for *housing* will give the Church a steady increasing income, in the form of rents, which will eventually go to reduce taxation, whereas charitable money spent in free food, etc. offers no financial basis of income whatever.

II. The second advantage of this procedure is, that if our Neo-Catholic Institution owns a working man's house, and reduces the rent—to take a concrete instance—of a man earning £1 per week, from five shillings to two, *i.e.*, to one tenth of his wages—it will not pauperize that man, but will merely do him justice.

III. The third advantage is, that if our Neo-Catholic Institution asks for gifts of houses and land, or money to purchase or erect houses, and makes this task the main aspect of its economic work, to begin with, it will teach us to regard the erection and tenure of the homes of the Nation, as we *surely* ought to do, as a moral rather than as a merely commercial affair.



The weakness of *all* municipal schemes for erecting working-class dwellings is, that they are based on the commercial principle of borrowed capital. Not merely does it follow that such municipal dwellings are too costly, in many instances, for working-class occupants. It has the further immense disadvantage that it conveys, to all concerned, a totally wrong impression concerning the moral importance of home. It is the contention of the writer that good homes are so absolutely essential to the moral and physical welfare of all classes that home-building is one of the few things which ought, for moral ends, to be undertaken by the community—but by the community organized on Neo-Catholic lines—making the physical and moral welfare of tenants, and not the highest possible profits and percentages, their chief concern.

This does not imply that there need be waste or an absence of business method. The point rather is that the community is, to-day, quite wealthy enough to be able to build first-class houses for everyone—as beautiful and hygienic as—within common-sense limits—they can be made, without getting, of necessity, more than a minimum return on capital laid out. This can, however, only be done if houses, land, or capital, are given to the community, *i.e.*, to our Neo-Catholic Institution, for this moral end, and not borrowed. And it is to this end that, I venture to submit, the great bulk of the money now wasted on charities should be largely devoted.

IV. The fourth, and perhaps the most necessary advantage of this procedure, that, by becoming a Landlord, our Neo-Catholic Institution will possess, as Landlord, a certain authority over its tenants (which all workers among the poor, and all social students, agree to be necessary) and will be in a position to discourage wrong and encourage right.

The Church tenant, for example, who habitually spends an excessive proportion of his wages on drink would have his rent raised (or, if you prefer so to express it, would be fined by a Church Court) and the extra rent, or fine, would go towards providing his children with meals, at his expense, and not the expense of his fellow-citizens.

The Church tenant—to take a second instance—who is capable, with the assistance of his brothers, of supporting his father and mother in old age, but does not do so, will not be allowed to live in a Church “Home” at all. On the other hand, the Church tenant who practically carries out the fifth Commandment, by making a home for the old folk, when their working days are over, will be encouraged by having his house from a Neo-Catholic Corporation on lower terms.

#### SUPERIORITY OF NEO-CATHOLIC, TO MUNICIPAL, HOUSING.

In both of these instances, how vastly superior is the position of the Church, as Landlord, to that of the Municipal Council. Associated, as a Municipal servant is, in the minds of the poor, with the Police

Forces and the Workhouse, he can hardly ever, when collecting rents, exercise moral influence over municipal tenants. It is his business to *get the rent*, without bothering whether the father of the family drinks or his family wander barefoot about the streets. The only rent-collector who will ever exercise a tactful moral influence must be one who represents the Church, and a moral principle which supplements, and is higher than, that of the Police Force.

A hasty reader of the foregoing may say : " Ah ! yes, but do you think working class tenants are ever going to allow a Church Court to fine them ? Will they not clear out of Church-owned houses and seek other quarters in such cases ? " My answer is, " No ! " If our Neo-Catholic Corporation acquires, by gift or purchase, a house usually charged for at the rate of four shillings per week, and lets it to a man at, say, half-a-crown per week, it is not reasonable to suppose that because, in consequence of his ill-treating his wife, the Church raises his rent, temporarily, to three-and-six, he will be such a fool as to leave and go back to a house which he cannot get, except from the Church Corporation, at less than four shillings.

To put the matter in a nutshell our Neo-Catholic Corporation will give the working classes new privileges, conditional to the acceptances of new duties.

ONCE THE CHURCH HAS BECOME A LANDLORD, SHE CAN MAKE THE HOME THE BASIS FROM WHICH SHE WILL SET OUT TO DEAL WITH MORE COMPLEX SOCIAL EVILS THAN THE HOUSING PROBLEM.

And now it should be noted that, once she has become a Landlord to any considerable extent, in a given town or village, a Neo-Catholic Corporation will be in a position to tackle other aspects of the Social Problem, with genuine hope of success. Convinced that our enthusiastic Social Workers must walk before they attempt to run, and that efficient home-building must be the basis of all our efforts, I do not propose to deal at length with these further efforts of the Church. A few suggestions must suffice.

#### THE MOBILITY OF LABOUR.

It is surely not unreasonable to suggest that, among its property, our Neo-Catholic Corporation might well own, in every village and town, a reasonable number of furnished Church lodgings? These would be at the disposal of *bona fide* labourers, married men by preference, who, to obtain work, are obliged constantly to go away from their homes. There are many thousands of these to whom such lodgings would be offered at as cheap a rate as possible, conditional to such men forwarding weekly—through the Church—to their wives a reasonable portion of their wages.

Such a scheme, or something like it, appears to be

both necessary and just. Mobility of labour is becoming increasingly vital to many aspects of modern commerce. But, under existing circumstances, it is effected, too often, on lines which leave the married worker precious little to send home to wife and children, who have frequently to be looked after or helped by Charity, of one kind or the other, in the town or village where their home is. For lodgings carry away a large part of his earnings, even if he is not tempted, by his absence from home ties, to spend his money unwisely or viciously. The result is, that wife and children suffer. Now, working in conjunction with Labour Bureaux and the Railways, our Neo-Catholic Corporation could, in every town and village, do much to mitigate the evils which now exist in this connection, and would, by establishing cheap furnished lodgings on the above terms, set big Employers of labour an example which they might well learn to follow.

#### THE CHURCH AND THE WIDOW.

Again, a Church which was a home-builder could, without any pauperizing, allow a widow and her family to live rent free, as a good Landlord in the countryside often does at the present time. It need scarcely be urged that common-sense arrangements would have to be made to safeguard such a widow against the "offers" of marriage which might flow in upon her—it being clearly stipulated that, if she married again, the usual rent would be charged her prospective spouse. Should she be a lady with



many admirers, this would enable her to distinguish the wheat from the chaff. Beyond this, every attempt would be made by the Church to secure just contributions from such a widow's family, and any relations of hers, being in a well-to-do position, who did not make a righteous contribution towards her support, would be discountenanced in the new moral atmosphere which the Church would create among all classes.

That, you will say, might cause friction ; but if you will assume that all such questions would be settled—not by hard and fast “ laws ”—but by local Social Wardens, anyone acquainted with the ordinary working of a parish, must be aware that, with average tact and discretion, the moral obligations of relatives might easily be encouraged and quickened by a Church which came in the guise of a Landlord in a way in which such obligations cannot be quickened at the point of the magisterial bayonet.

For Magistrates will tell you that not a week passes but they have cases brought before them with which they are utterly unable to deal, simply because moral, and not legal, pressure is what is required.

#### THE CHURCH AND UNEMPLOYMENT.

There are so many aspects of Unemployment, that it is impossible to cover more than a section of it in the present volume. But, as the reader will, on reflection, perceive, once we possessed a Neo-

Catholic Corporation—a “State within the State”—which possesses house property, and furnished lodgings, such a Corporation will, gradually, become a large indirect employer of labour, and will be able to arrange its contracts—as the State does in Germany—during seasons, or times of the year, when trade tends to be slack.

At such times of the year, the public are always ready to subscribe money to give the Unemployed work. The trouble is as to what work they should be set. The trouble also is to distinguish between the *bona-fide* worker, and the man who is morally or physically inefficient. It is surely not too much to assume that, in course of time, the Church, as Landlord, will become sufficiently acquainted with the characters of her tenants, and their neighbours, as to be able to distinguish between the various sections of unemployed and unemployable, to treat each case as a separate problem, and, where necessary, exercise a firm discipline, and subject the morally inefficient to physical training, or to a moral atmosphere which will regenerate them.

On the other hand, in the case of the really efficient workman—thrown out of trade for a month, or a few months, during cyclical periods when trade is universally depressed—our Neo-Catholic Institution would surely be justified in remitting, or reducing rents, altogether, at such periods. By remitting rents when trade was slack, and insisting on thrift during “fat” years, the Church would learn,

in due course of time, how best to enable the steady working man, at such periods, to weather the storm as the Capitalist does.

OUR NEO-CATHOLIC CORPORATION TO BE TO THE WORKING CLASS FAMILY WHAT A BALANCE AT THE BANK IS TO THE CAPITALIST.

Here, as elsewhere, I submit no hard and fast scheme. Every town will have to make primary experiments in dealing with its Neo-Catholic tenants. The chief objective of all such efforts should be educative—to encourage foresight and intelligence. Important as method is, we do not want merely mechanical devices for dealing with seasons of unemployment, and other ills. Still less should we wish the working man to learn to lean upon our Neo-Catholic Institution, and run to it, like a baby, at every crisis. There was a most important substratum of truth in the early Victorian gospel of "self-help," which should never be lost sight of. At the same time, the man living under present conditions, who has no capital—and how few have! is so completely at the mercy of cycles of bad trade, utterly beyond his personal control, that it is too cruel to expose him, as we do at present, to the full fury of a commercial crisis, which originated, perhaps, in some far-off land, which deprives him *here* of employment, through no fault of his own. To tell such a man he must rely solely upon self-help, is like telling the inhabitants of a town wrecked by

earthquake, that they ought to have anticipated its coming, and must ask no help from foreign lands, as they wander homeless and foodless along the lava-strewn shores of their Southern home. What, however, we do want to secure for every British citizen is, that in the last resort—when he has made every personal effort—there exists a powerful capitalized Neo-Catholic Institution of a disciplinary character, but kindlier than the workhouse : a Neo-Catholic Institution which is a Landlord, and which, when the complex character of modern trade has driven his family and himself into a corner, will be to him what a balance in the Bank is to the Capitalist.

That a wealthy Neo-Catholic Corporation, owning house-property, could effect this more economically and efficiently than any other Institution is the proposition which I submit to the dispassionate consideration of my countrymen.

IT IS FOR THE MOTHERS OF BRITAIN, RATHER THAN POLITICIANS, TO ASK US ALL TO MAKE SACRIFICES IN ORDER TO MAKE THE CHURCH A POWERFUL EXEMPLARY LANDLORD.

And now, granted that it is for the Church rather than “the State” or the Municipality, to solve the Housing Problem let us consider how best the Church can persuade all classes voluntarily to endow a Neo-Catholic Institution with property and wealth—as our Norman Nobility used to do.



Who, then, can most fairly ask the Nation to endow the Church, to make sacrifices for the sake of the children? Who best can ask the degraded to submit to the moral discipline of new Social Wardens? A still small voice surely suggests that the only class who can—without hypocrisy—ask us all to make sacrifices, and to put the welfare of the family and the children first, are the Mothers of Britain. And, while there are many worthy objects as regards which we can still look for light and leadership to politicians, we must surely, in reference to so *primitive* a matter as the providing of efficient homes, bethink us of that little hand which has for centuries rocked the cradle and ruled the world. It is surely, my countrymen, to the Mothers of Britain that we men must look for inspiration, as the only class who can—with precious few exceptions—ask us to be unselfish, ask us to be generous towards each other, ask us to forget our passing class squabbles, and pull together.

“To the devil with the parties, it is Mrs. Bull  
my hearties,

Who must rouse the civic pride of the Master  
of the seas.”

For the Home is the basis of our home and over-sea Civilization. Rooted in the soil of centuries, it is the principle of the Family which has stood by most of our race in every quarter of the globe. And if, when, in intellectual and scientific matters, we are making such strides, we cannot at last, guarantee



efficient housing to every British family in order to make this land worth living in, and worth dying for, then we must, indeed, be a precious poor set ; at the thought of whose galling incompetency Drake, Raleigh, and Strafford must surely turn in their graves.

But more—far more—than this. In due course of time, the functions of the Church as Landlord will place many of the Mothers and women of Britain on a new and stronger footing than they stand at present. To-day the woman who marries is, to too large an extent, at the financial mercy of her husband, or, if she does not marry, of her father ; nor has she any real remedy against father or husband, if he turns out a “wastrel.” Such a system is utterly detrimental to her functions and duties whether as a mother or a citizen.

#### BRIEF HISTORIC SUMMARY OF THE POSITION OF WOMAN.

Looking back over history, the student of sociology gratefully remembers that our laws and customs are, in this connection, based on the old Roman principle called the *patria potestas*, or power of the Father. He further recalls how this system was a sublime advance on previous social conditions, under which marriage did not exist, and children were merely known by the names of their mothers, their fatherhood being uncertain. To-day, however, we have reached a pitch of civilization when we need an advance on the *patria potestas* principle.

While asserting the sacredness of the family tie, we require that society should be organized on lines whereby the Church can be, when necessary, the champion of the financial interests of Motherhood, and can, in course of time, be legally empowered, if necessary, to secure to the wife a just proportion of her husband's wages.

On some such lines a woman will be in a position to secure greater respect, from the man she marries, for her daughters and herself, than she can be permanently certain of at present. The home will, in a unique sense, be hers; and, when she marries, and does a man the infinite honour of allowing him to be the father of her children, he will have to pledge himself—as our marriage service suggests—to support those children efficiently. If he does not, his wife will have a Church Institution, which owns her home—more delicate than the Police Court—to which she can go for redress.

Without being a warm advocate of all the methods adopted by those women who desire the suffrage, anyone who values truth, must surely confess that it is the unjustness of the economic position under which women have always laboured, which is the source of the Suffragette movement; and that, from many points of view, the women's political party is, in Britain, the one political party whose sincerity is unquestioned.

I do not wish, needlessly, to harrow the feelings of the reader. But, if one only thinks it out, the

situation of woman, at the economic mercy of man, is really the source of vaster evils than are often recognised. Here you have the most important of all civic duties—viz. the up-bringing of children—left to the sport of circumstance. Here you are faced by the extraordinary fact that a woman, who marries, has to run the risk of having to fight, on behalf of her children, against the selfishness of her husband, who possesses a prior right to herself over money, which ought to go to the upkeep of her family. For he may bring home nothing but a few shillings, and of those the Landlord has a legal claim prior to that of the wife.

Now, there is only one line of action which offers a permanent solution of this evil. It is that the Church must do something more than solemnize the marriage tie. It must undertake a two-fold function—educational and disciplinary. In the first place, it must educate all classes to understand, more fully, those natural and unalterable laws—spiritual, moral, and physical—upon which, alone, happy marriages can be based. In the second place it must possess a reasonable amount of Neo-Catholic property for the housing, not of prosperous artisans, but of that casual labour class which is economically weak, and requires a reasonable amount of moral discipline and assistance. Under such a system the home will, in all such instances, be, for all practical purposes, the property of a working man's wife. It will be held, that is to say, on her behalf, by the Church.

She will become, under this system, what we have long pretended that she is—a Queen in her own home. For she will possess the ability to call in the whole moral and practical help of the Neo-Catholic Corporation, if she wants it.

#### THE NEED FOR GREATER SIMPLICITY.

It should here, in passing, be noted that there is one important method whereby the women of the country can help to raise funds to make the Home the basis of Social Reform. This is that, without the aid of the Ladies, an ideal of greater simplicity can never animate the wealthier classes. For it is to be feared that one of the chief foes to that scientific benevolence, which should be one of the primary characteristics of a Neo-Catholic Civilization, is the social extravagance of the less educated, but wealthy, section, of the feminine world. From this point of view, it is surely to be hoped that a portion of the Amazonian energy which Ladies who desire a vote spend, in molesting perplexed politicians, will, at no very distant date, be directed towards an attempt to impress upon certain members of their own sex that the cause of the woman-worker lies far more largely in the hands of her wealthier sisters, than in those of the Parliamentary legislator.

#### ENTER THE QUEEN.

Now, if, for the sake of our children, John Bull really is to solve the Housing Problem, and have done with it—for this terrible evil has been hanging round long enough—he surely wants a

single symbol which shall stand for the Mothers of Britain, and the Family Principle : a symbol which everyone throughout the Empire will understand the moment he sees it, and reverence silently as he does the Flag. We must surely, that is to say, select one of the Mothers of Britain that she may be the type of all the rest. And surely we shall not go far wrong if we select her Majesty, Queen Alexandra, as the one who, on behalf of the Mothers of Britain, can invite all classes, within reasonable limits, voluntarily to endow the Church—though on Neo-Catholic lines—and make it a Landlord for the sake of the children. It is not a question of Laws and Parliaments : it is a question of appealing to the heart of the Nation, as Mrs. Browning understood when she wrote :—

“I am listening here in Rome,  
 Over Alps a voice is sweeping—  
 ‘England’s cruel, save us some  
 Of those victims in her keeping !’  
 Lordly English, think it o’er,  
 Cæsar’s doing is all undone !  
 You have cannons on your shore,  
 And free Parliaments in London ;  
 Princes’ parks, and merchants’ homes,  
 Tents for soldiers, ships for seamen,—  
 Ay, but ruins worse than Rome’s  
 In your pauper men and women.”

That appeals to all classes to endow the Church with gifts of houses, land, etc. can be made with



greater effect by the Queen, as representing the women of Britain, than by any mere man, is a proposition which must, I think, commend itself to all who understand human nature. It was Napoleon who urged that the weakness of all modern legislation is that it does not appeal to the imagination; and Burke was surely right when, in that glorious description which he handed down to us of Mary Antoinette (ere a Socialistic attempt to solve the social ills of France through a popularly controlled State rather than through a progressive conception of the functions of the Church, destroyed the French Monarchy) he complains of the weakness of that revolutionary Liberalism which would reform by legislative force rather than appeals to chivalry.\*

Surely, though they have hitherto thought to

---

\* "Under this scheme of things," cried Burke, "a King is but a man, a Queen is but a woman, a woman is but an animal and an animal not of the highest order. . . . On a scheme of this barbarous philosophy, which is the offspring of cold hearts and muddy understandings, and which is as void of solid wisdom as it is destitute of all taste and elegance, laws are to be supported only by their own terrors. . . . Nothing is left which engages the affections on the part of the Commonwealth. On the principle of this mechanic philosophy our institutions can never be embodied, if I may use the expression, in persons, so to create in us love, veneration, admiration, or attachment. But that sort of reason which banishes the affections is incapable of filling their place."

—*Thoughts on the French Revolution.*

“speed up” progress by disendowing the Church—Mr. Asquith, Lord Crewe, and Mr. Lloyd George will join those of us who are old Tory Cavaliers, in recognising that we can best solve our Social Problems by appealing to all classes by the love they bear their Queen, and by the chivalry due to the women of Britain. Surely that shrewd intelligence which makes Mr. Balfour so rightly scornful of attempts to promote morality through the House of Commons, will tell him that Neo-Catholicism is the true Tory alternative to slippery political Socialism. Surely, too, he will be wise if he bethinks him of the high precedent which was set by his distinguished ancestor—Lord Burleigh—in the reign of good Queen Bess.

For, in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, Britain was face to face with a crisis; and, for forty years, the threatened coming of the Armada, necessitated that appeals should be made to something higher than legislative force. Then it was that Queen Elizabeth—by the advice of Mr. Balfour’s ancestor—Lord Burleigh, issued a charge, as the chroniclers have it, to “*men of worship, and others of their county to shewe their dewtyfull devotion unto her Majesty’s service and their love to their country, and set themselves at a higher rate than they could be pressed unto by Law.*”<sup>(a)</sup>

---

(a) State Papers, Elizabeth V. CXII., page 45. (Quoted from Somerset and the Armada, by E. Green, F.S.A. London: Harrison).

Have not those good old days, when men were ready to risk their lives for Church and Queen, a lesson for the Britain of to-day? Are there not tens of thousands of Cavaliers, in these ancient Isles, who resent the idea of self-sacrifice being promoted by "Bung" placards and amphitheatre "turns," who would support, with unprecedented generosity, a carefully-thought-out scheme to make the Church a Landlord and the Home a basis of Social Reform, if they were asked to do so by the First Lady in the Empire; who, though, on fitting occasions, she glitters at Court in diamonds and gold, is more often to be seen, with womanly pity, visiting the hospitals and humble homes of her loyal and loving subjects.

#### RELATIONS OF THE ABOVE PROPOSALS TO CURRENT POLITICS.

Now, in submitting that a Tory Institution, the Church, should become a Landlord, who would be of service *not* to the majority of families in the country who lead happy and contented lives, but to the submerged tenth—I am not attempting to suggest a party policy, but a National Policy. For that Tory Institution, the Church, will concede to Liberalism the Liberal principle that these new Church endowments shall be controlled jointly by Clergy, Ministers and Laity.

While this is true, it is so vital to our social well-being that party recriminations should cease, that, should the Lords accept the Liberal Budget, it is

surely manifest that Liberals would be sportsmen of the first water, if they quietly deliberate whether they themselves allow this land valuation to take place at all, or at any rate, until they have very carefully considered how far such a valuation will help, or hinder, the voluntary endowment of a Neo-Catholic Corporation.

I cannot but cordially submit that Liberals will be well advised to do this, because (1) their recent attempts to disendow the Church in Wales, (2) the fact that their recent Budget takes unearned increment due to the Church, (3) the fact that they have made no appeals to benevolence, (4) the fact that they would transform land and capital into coin for current state expenses, when what we want is a Neo-Catholic Corporation to which land and capital can be voluntarily bequeathed, (5) the fact that they would centralize Social Reform at Westminster, when what we want is not oratory in London, but practical Corporations in the provinces, which make the Church-owned Home, and not the political platform, the basis of Social Reform, (6) the fact that their attack on unearned increment which happens to be owned by certain Members of the House of Lords, will only lead to an increase in Protectionist unearned increment, when a Unionist swing of the pendulum sets in, and Capitalists who have been attacked retaliate—these *six solid facts* compel an unprejudiced mind to enquire how far the bulk of our Liberal politicians, who would effect Social



Reform by *attacks*, have a claim to be Social Reformers at all, and whether their manœuvre to stir up a theatrical quarrel with the House of Lords, is not an attempt to throw dust in the eyes of a Nation which was beginning to suspect that this is the truth.

If Mr. Balfour continues to let the Nation feel that, under his leadership, the Tory Party is not, as it was under Lord Beaconsfield, the Party of the Church, but the party of the Plutocracy, I do not see that the claims of Unionists, to be Social Reformers, is a whit better. Nevertheless, in view of Mr. Churchill's challenge to an ancient and honourable party, to many of whom the Church is dear—I venture humbly to submit that there are *bona fide* Church and State Tories who may feel constrained, in the interests of Social Peace, to make a scheme whereby that Church, which Liberals threaten to disendow, becomes the trump card which the Tories play at the next election.

With (1) the Church as Landlord ; (2) a Neo-Catholic Corporation to moralize the introduction of Tariff Reform ; (3) Tariff Reform to create variety of employment, and moralize trade ; (4) National Training in camp for four months, between the ages of eighteen and twenty-six, in a year to be selected by young men at their own choice—as the four planks of its programme, the Tory party would offer the country something better than that “popular” and “effective” alternative to slippery political Socialism



which Mr. Winston Churchill challenges them to produce. They would be offering the country a policy, disciplinary as well as social, which would not merely appeal to the just desire of the casual labourer and his wife to better their conditions, but would also win respect from all responsible citizens.

At the same time, it would be utterly unsportsmanlike for the Tory Party to make party capital out of the principle of voluntary benevolence, without giving their opponents several months warning, and without giving the country, as a whole, that opportunity of carefully considering a new National Programme, which the country ought, unquestionably, to have.

Does it not follow, that the most sportsmanlike course is for both parties to join hands and appeal, to all classes, voluntarily to endow the Church. For, when a Neo-Catholic Corporation is efficiently endowed, it will, within a reasonable period, be able (1) To make the Home the disciplinary basis of Social Reform for the casual labourer ; (2) To establish efficient gymnasia, and recreation rooms in every parish, as Father Dolling did at Portsmouth ; (3) By co-operation with that Public House Trust, which already owns 260 public-houses, to place the local public-house in the hands of men who will not push the drink ; (4) By co-operation with Big Provision Merchants and the Banks (see Chap. vii.), guarantee that the local Grocery Establishment supplies clean, wholesome food at righteous prices.

## CHAPTER X.

## THE CHURCH IN ACTION :

OR,

THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A NEO-CATHOLIC  
CORPORATION.

“Ring out a slowly dying cause,  
And ancient forms of party strife;  
Ring in the nobler modes of life,  
With sweeter manners, purer laws.

Ring out false pride in place and blood,  
The civic slander and the spite;  
Ring in the love of truth and right,  
Ring in the common love of good.”

And now it will be necessary to suggest the broad principles in accordance with which a Neo-Catholic Institution might be controlled jointly by the Churches and the Laity.

QUALIFICATION NECESSARY FOR A CHURCH VOTE ON  
FINANCIAL MATTERS.

First, may I remind the reader that the term “Neo-Catholic” has been used, throughout these pages, to imply that anyone who is willing to work for the Church ought to be entitled to a vote on questions dealing with her social Finance. By this

it is not implied that the spiritual aspects of Religion do not matter. On the contrary, it is assumed that the spiritual element must be her sustaining fuel. The point urged is merely that, in regard to her social work, the Church should recognise more largely than at present the Pauline principle that there are "divers orders in the Church," and that willingness to do social work for the community ought to entitle any citizen—man or woman—of the age of, shall we say, twenty-five, to a vote for electing a representative to a local Neo-Catholic Council, which shall control the new funds of the Church.

There are many who would urge that attendance at the Sacrament, thrice annually, should be the test for a Neo-Catholic vote. Others would insist that Baptism should be essential to such a vote. If, however, ecclesiastical tests are to be applied to the giving of a vote on economic matters there are bound to be warm differences of opinion between those who hold the doctrine of Apostolic Succession and those who would fain see a rapprochement between the Anglican Church and Nonconformity, between those who favour the sprinkling of water at Baptism, and those who favour complete immersion, etc.

As against this, I cannot but submit that, of vast importance as are the spiritual aspects of religion and those ceremonies which are—to some physical channels of spiritual grace—to others merely helpful

symbols—the principle that there are divers orders in the Church is one which should lead us to the conclusion that a man's readiness to do social work for the community ought to be accepted by the Church as entitling him to a place in her ranks, to the extent of possessing a vote on financial matters, whatever may be his views on the ecclesiastical aspects of religion.

In submitting this, I am not, for a moment, urging that faith in the spiritual, as well as the moral aspects of existence, is not essential to *full* Churchmanship. My point is rather that, with most types of character, self-sacrifice is the first step in the upward life, and that when they find a man who is willing to do social work for the community, those whose spiritual faith is strong ought not to debar him from contributing either time or money to such a task as the juster housing of our population on Neo-Catholic lines, merely because his faith in spiritual phenomena is weak, or because he would express that faith in the language of Spiritual Science, rather than of the Grecian Metaphysics of the Creeds.

Because the Church has need for able Laymen it does not, I submit, follow that *anyone* should have a vote in electing to a local Church Council, representatives to control Neo-Catholic capital. For experience in State matters has, surely, taught us that purely "popular" election is a system which tends

to reflect the moods of the Crowd, rather than the mind of the Nation.

That the man who has not done military service for the defence of "the State" ought not to have a hand in its policy, is, indeed, a truth which was rudely impressed upon the Nation on Majuba night, and by the irresponsible tone of a section of the Nation, and the Press, when the negotiations were conducted with President Kruger.

"Yet ye were saved by a remnant (and your  
land's long suffering Star),

When your strong men cheered in their  
millions

While your striplings went to the war."<sup>(a)</sup>

This same principle—that the Jingoist, who does nothing for National Defence, ought not to have a hand in controlling the policy of "the State"—is a principle which surely applies, with no less emphasis, to the control of the Church. Indeed, by insisting that the undertaking of definite work shall be the essential qualification for a Neo-Catholic vote, the Church will be paving the way for the application of the same principle to the State—a principle which admits, to the full, the democratic principle—and merely insists that there is no room, in either Church or State, for the absolutely functionless.

---

<sup>a)</sup> Kipling, "*The Islanders*."



OUR NEO-CATHOLIC INSTITUTION MUST BE CONTROLLED  
BY ELECTORS WHOM THE NATION CAN RESPECT.

There is another most important reason why a vote should be limited to those engaged in working at some definite branch of social work, however humble. This reason is, that if our Neo-Catholic Institution is really to secure the vast number of gifts and bequests which it is desirable for her to secure, if she is to be a Landlord and Shareholder on a large scale, her finances—both local and national—must be controlled by Neo-Catholic representatives whom all classes can respect.

By limiting votes, for the election of such representatives, to those who are engaged in definite social work for the Church, to those who voluntarily endow her, and to their descendants to the second generation and, at the same time, giving votes to women workers, we shall be so enlarging the area of choice for Church representatives, that there will be every prospect of our Neo-Catholic Institution being controlled locally, and, in course of time, nationally, by people who have no irons in the fire.

How vital it is that a new National Institution which is destined to moralize, first housing, and, later on, trade, should be controlled by permanent Neo-Catholic Wardens, and representatives of the highest integrity, it is scarcely necessary to submit. There exists, alas! a certain type of man who enters local "public life" for private ends, and at present flour-

ishes under the principle of popular municipal election, who must be rigidly excluded from any control whatever, of Church finances.

DISTRICTS WHERE THERE ARE NO RESIDENT GENTRY MUST BE CATERED FOR BY THE DEVELOPMENT OF UNIVERSITY SETTLEMENTS IN THE PROVINCES.

The difficulty which is, in this connection, most likely to arise, is in those sections of our cities where there are no resident gentry. To meet this evil, the principle of University Settlements, which has met with such success in London, must surely be extended to the Provinces. And wealthy donors, ready to support the Church's activity as Landlord, in those quarters of a given city where its casual labourers reside, would, undoubtedly, be wise, if, in considering the desirability of giving house-property, or money for its progressive purchase, they declined to give any support until they have fully assured themselves that it will be controlled by men of honour.

CO-OPERATION BETWEEN THE CLERGY, UNIVERSITY SETTLEMENTS, RETIRED BUSINESS MEN, AND THE LADIES.

In this connection, it is unfortunate that many Clergymen and University men who would never dream of engaging in "jobbery," are not always efficient business men. This difficulty might surely be got over, so far as the work of the Church, as Landlord, is concerned, by the three following suggestions :—

(a) An office training in a business house, for twelve months, on leaving the University, would, surely, be an excellent thing for a proportion of candidates for Holy Orders, or of Social Wardens. I feel sure that many of our Merchants and Business men, would admit such young men into their offices for training, as a part of their contribution to the work of a Neo-Catholic Corporation.

(b) By delaying the Age of Ordination, and encouraging a system whereby a candidate for Holy Orders shall, after taking his University Degree, and spending a year at a Theological College, spend a further year as Secretary, or Assistant, to a fully-trained Parish Priest, or Social Warden, who will teach him method and the rapid despatch of affairs; or, as assistant Secretary, to a "Settlement" or local Neo-Catholic Corporation.

By some such device many of our older Clergy would be saved much detail work, while the prospective candidate for Holy Orders would acquire business habits, and gain that insight into Parish work, which nothing but constant contact with a mind engaged in controlling a large parish will give him.\*

---

\* It is surely the misfortune of our present system that Junior Clergy enter upon their work without proper training, in what might be called, applied Moral Science, viz. the sympathetic dealing with human beings as separate problems. They attempt to apply theological ideas, which they have acquired from books, to minds whose education

(c) By relying on co-operation between the clergy and public-spirited citizens who have retired from business, and are prepared to place their long business experience at the service of the Church, provided that the burden and heat of the day is borne by those who bring to it all the ardour and enthusiasm of youth.

As Bacon has very wisely observed, "Old men are apt to object too much, consult too long, adventure too little." Young men, on the other hand, "embrace more than they can hold, stir more than they can quiet, fly to the end without considering the means." It follows, he concludes, that the best achievements are those in which young and old collaborate.

---

has proceeded on different lines. Close intercourse with a Vicar of long experience might do much to lessen this evil. It is, however, really too much to ask of the ordinary Vicar, that he should devote his time exclusively to the training of a young Curate. On the other hand, training given to one sent to assist him in some such capacity as that of private Secretary, can be given informally without undue waste of time.

By some such devices as the foregoing, candidates for Holy Orders, or Social Wardens, would enter upon their work at the age of—shall we say twenty-five?—with the energy of youth, business habits, and a fund of practical wisdom, which it would take them years to acquire on our present lines. For the Church too often equips such men with bookish theories, and expects them, without a full knowledge of the world, to undertake tasks which surely require something in the nature of moral apprenticeship.



Following this wise advice, it must, I think, be manifest that, when planning out the work to be done in a definite district of a given town, the general principle should be observed, that any important business negotiations should be carefully watched over by a retired business man, or a small committee of such men, who blend a readiness to serve the Church with a wisdom which will not allow rash young Churchmen to purchase, on behalf of the Church, absolutely dilapidated house-property, with onerous ground-rents, under the impression that they have secured a "bargain!"

On the other hand, the furnishing of Church lodgings, the selection of suitable Matrons to control them, and all domestic details, are such as should obviously be left, very largely, to the women representatives, the importance of whose presence on Church Councils cannot easily be over-estimated.

#### THE PROBLEM OF HOLY ORDERS.

Such considerations lead one inevitably to the question of the vast number of men who to-day find themselves unable to take Holy Orders from inability to sign the "Articles." This is a topic on which it is difficult to speak without awakening controversy. There are, however, signs that, under the guidance of the Spirit of Truth, we are moving not away from, but towards, an Age of Faith, when a greater degree of scientific unanimity on the spiritual, as well as the moral, aspects of human



destiny must inevitably arise among all classes. It may well follow that the doubts of many may be relieved by some expression of the Catholic Creed, on lines whereby a somewhat deeper emphasis will be laid on the functions of the Third Person of the Trinity, the Spirit of Truth, and when the Church will look to the present and the future as well as the past, for her inspiration.

If, in submitting that, by some such expression of her Historic Faith, the Church will, eventually, encourage many who are now diffident, to take Holy Orders—I am wrong, Time will, in the Providence of God, assert His will. The practical point on which, for the present, I would lay stress, is that, in order to make her an efficient disciplinary Landlord, the collaboration of many types of Churchmen and Church-women is surely essential. We shall never, I fancy, arrive at complete unanimity of Religious "Opinion." The late Lord Salisbury made some singularly wise suggestions in this connection many years ago, which are still fresh to-day.

"There are three schools in the Church," said Lord Salisbury, speaking in reference to the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill, "which I might designate by other names, but which I prefer to call the Sacramental, the Emotional, and the Philosophical. They are schools which, more or less, except when they have been crushed by the strong hand of power, have been found in the Church in every age. *They arise, not from any difference in the truth itself, but*

*because the truth must necessarily assume different tints, as it is refracted through the different media of different minds.* But it is upon the frank and loyal tolerance of these schools that the existence of your Establishment depends."

Standing hard by this truth, and observing towards the spiritual ideals of those from whom we differ, that same respectful reverence which we desire others to display towards our own, we can hardly go very far wrong, if, in an endeavour to settle, at any rate, the Housing Problem, we agree—for the sake of the children—to lay aside all that may hinder us from godly union and concord.

#### CHURCH FINANCE AND THE REMUNERATION OF THE CLERGY.

Whilst I have not suggested hitherto, that any portion of the rents\* from the new property of the Church, should go towards enlarging the ranks of the Clergy, a portion should undoubtedly do so. The problem of existing Church endowments is too complicated for me to enter into here. But should our Neo-Catholic Corporation acquire large gifts of wealth, I believe that some slight change might,

---

\* It is scarcely unreasonable to assume that, within a quarter-of-a-century, the entire cost of National Education will be borne by our Neo-Catholic Institution. It would, however, be premature to deal with this topic in the present volume, fascinating as the topic may be to the over-burdened tax-payer.

eventually, be made in the management of the existing Agricultural property of the Church, on lines which would, on all Church lands, improve the present deplorable status of many agricultural labourers, do much to keep the people on the land, and set some of our more careless Landowners an example, which they might well follow. It was the Church which was the first to abolish serfdom on Church lands in the Middle Ages; and if, on all existing Church lands, the Church could afford to lower her rents to those Farmers who agreed to pay their labourers a higher wage, the difficulty of keeping the people on the land would be considerably alleviated.\* The proposals in accordance with which Liberals would tax unearned increment on Church lands, would militate against improving the lot of the agricultural labourer on the above lines, and this ought surely to receive their careful attention.

Turning from the question of present Church endowments to the future stipends of the Clergy

---

\* To avoid confusion I have forborne dealing with social reform as it concerns the agricultural labourer. In this connection, I cannot but submit that the wisest course for "the State" to pursue is to abolish death duties on agricultural land, altogether, and initiate a system whereby an incoming heir, instead of paying a death duty, agrees, as an alternative, to reduce rents to Farmers, conditional to Farmers increasing the wages of their labourers. Time alone has prevented me from showing fully how the new death duties on agricultural property will hit, rather than help, the Agricultural Labourer.

and Social Wardens, it will surely commend itself to the common-sense of the Nation that our Clergy should be, invariably, housed rent-free on new Church property. With so many empty houses, in practically all our towns, it is surely a pity that the Church should not, long ago, have asked for gifts of houses, and cut down working expenses by lodging Curates and Church Workers rent-free. By such means, we may surely hope that the day is not far distant when a Curate, or Social Warden, of the age of twenty-five, who has been *fully* trained on lines indicated above, will be offered £150 per annum, and allowed to live rent-free. At thirty this stipend should reach £200, and at thirty-five £300, with facilities for the education of his children, such as Wesleyan Ministers possess, thanks to the common-sense of their laity.

By this means, a good deal of jealousy which, not unnaturally, exists at present on the question of preferment, would be removed, and the Clergy and Social Wardens would be placed in a position when, if not affluent, they would be able to possess decent libraries, to keep abreast of the times, to exercise a modest hospitality, and make their homes models of what home-life should be, without, as many a Clergyman and his wife are now compelled to do, knowing that even the most modest forms of social hospitality are entirely beyond their means.

At the same time, the writer advocates no system which will make the Church, in a worldly sense, a



“career.” What we surely want to do is merely to free the Clergy and Social Wardens from harassing financial worry, and, at the same time, inaugurate a system of discipline and efficient, all-round, training which will guarantee that, before a man takes Holy Orders, he is really equipped for his work, and is worth the salary offered him.

#### RELATIONS OF THE CHURCH TO NONCONFORMITY.

And now there are those who will ask what is to be the relation between the Church and Nonconformity: or, as others would express it, between the Church of England and her sister Churches? Obviously, for all social purposes, they must co-operate! There are, I know, many who will refuse to welcome such co-operation; but here the common-sense of the vast lay element will come between. For, if the Churches wrangle, we can, in every town, establish a Neo-Catholic Institution to be controlled exclusively by Social Wardens, who will settle the Housing Problem, without the assistance (though that would—I personally hold—be deplorable), of either Priests or Ministers.

Lastly, it is, perhaps, necessary to remove misconceptions which may have arisen in the minds of those to whom the name Protestant is dear, and to whom the term “Neo-Catholic,” used in these pages, will suggest some sinister scheme of revoking the spiritual principles of the Reformation.



With the object, therefore, of making it absolutely clear how largely Evangelical Protestantism is moving towards a recognition of the moral advantages of propertied Catholicism, may I suggest to any who may have been perplexed by the "name" Neo-Catholic, that, at a time when the material for this volume was but half assembled, and I was still hesitating as to how far it was wise to be thoroughly bold in claiming for a Neo-Catholic Corporation the right of becoming a Landlord and a Shareholder, it was not in the Anglican community that I found the boldest champions of the practical moral functions of the Church in business matters. On the contrary, it was at Birmingham that a Nonconformist and an Evangelical—the Rev. J. H. Jowett—with a larger intelligence of the needs of the age, and a bolder faith than has yet, to my knowledge, been displayed by any member of the Established Church at home or abroad, struck a note which encouraged me to proceed.

"I am becoming more and more wearied and disappointed," said Dr. Jowett at Birmingham, towards the close of 1908, "with the futility of party strife. Grave social problems, like that of the unemployed and the question of providing old-age pensions, are thrown into the cock-pit of party controversy, and are used as mere bribes and dodges of party engineering. They are looked at from the standpoint of party tactics and expedients, and not from the point of view of the welfare of the State. One of the perils, in times like this, is the amateur who

offered sensational settlements of grave problems in inexperience and ignorance. *The Church is going to disentangle the moral issues of the problem, which are so often hidden in party controversy, and assert them with courage and independence. The Church is going to tell men their duty, and devote her strength to arousing the conscience. It is the sleeping conscience which is our national failing; our moral difference which is our curse."*

At the same time a certain type of Nonconformist will perhaps pardon me if I observe, in no spirit of malice, in the first place that there has arisen, during the last quarter-of-a-century, in certain sections of the Nonconformist world, a most notable unwillingness to concede to other religious communities that religious tolerance which Nonconformity arose to promote. Second, may I submit that, while, at the Reformation, there was undoubted need, within the Church, for protest, a religion which is merely Protestant, may, as Burke used to say, result in the man who is the completest Protestant, or 'protestor,' being a man who protests against everything, and has, in consequence, no religion at all. And though, for my part, I am convinced that a new age of faith is before us, there exist among us far too many signs of this having occurred. Finally, it is surely true that, like the House of Commons, Nonconformity has, largely, fulfilled that destructive work which caused Nonconformity to assume such an important place in the Body Politic.

As regards at any rate the social aspects of the Church's work, what we surely want is Conformity rather than Nonconformity. A Neo-Catholic Corporation which sets out to moralize housing and trade, to make the Church a Landlord and Shareholder, must obviously be one which asks all classes to conform to social obligations and not dissent from them.

But more than this : if our Neo-Catholic Corporation is to do its work, it must win the respect of the crowd. And to do this it must throw over the present the halo of the past, in a way that Institutions which have merely been prominent for a few brief centuries, can never do. It must be an Institution which is definitely associated with those Gothic piles, which stud this ancient realm, and awe the shallow spirit of Modernity with the thought of Grecian and Roman Empires, which fell because they were founded on a merely physical basis—though bequeathing all that was best in their beauty and discipline to a Catholicism which spiritualised both beauty and discipline. It must be an Institution emerging out of Catholicism, and so closely associated with it as to be hardly distinguishable from it. For, sunk deep in the hearts of our race—like an anchor of the soul, sure and steadfast—there is an abiding loyalty to that ancient Church which has, for twenty solemn centuries, been a Mother to the motherless ; to whose sacred offices the most careless turn at the hallowed moment of marriage ;

and which is only accused of indifference to existing social evils by those who do not recognise with what unscientific fanaticism she was despoiled of her property three centuries ago, and the generous devices which must be adopted to re-endow her to-day.

MEMBERS OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND AND NONCONFORMITY, AND POLITICIANS, OF ALL PARTIES, CAN UNITE TO ESTABLISH A HOME-ACQUIRING CORPORATION.

Here, surely, we are on safe and certain ground ! Differ, as we may long continue to do, over various details of the spiritual aspects of religion, of Tariff Reform, or Free Trade, we can all, surely, unite to make the Church a Landlord, and the Home the basis of Social Reform.

That, when we have thus learned to co-operate, and have moralized housing, we may be capable of making our Neo-Catholic Corporation a Shareholder in industry, is surely well within the bounds of possibility. We must, however—as Neo-Catholics—attempt the simpler function first.

THE NEED FOR A SIMPLE STRATEGIC BASIS FOR  
SOCIAL REFORMERS.

It is always thus when order has to be secured out of anarchy. Whether you wish to re-organize a great business or a scattered Army, history invariably records that, to succeed, you must not attempt the complicated. You must go to the heart of a situation, and begin the task of re-organizing on the simplest lines. If his army is disorganized, his



troops scattered over hill and dale, it is idle for a General to issue a host of complicated orders to his disheartened followers. The only Commander who, under such circumstances, knows what leadership, at a crisis, means, is one who cancels existing orders, and, in terms which permit of no alternative, secures certain needful outposts, but commands the great bulk of his disheartened host to fall back upon some tested base of operations, which is well-provisioned, efficiently fortified, and capable of standing—if need be—an eternal siege.

It is surely somewhat thus with all who love their country at the present time. They are scattered—in disconnected groups—all over our land, each engaged on some individualistic task, their heads filled with ideas belonging to that Individualistic, and anti-Corporate epoch, which began at the Reformation, and has, to-day, passed away. We have a Puseyite Party, a Low Church Party, a Broad Church Party. We have Wesleyans and Congregationalists, Baptists, Unitarians, Plymouth Brethren, and Quakers. We have Fair Trade Unionists, Free Trade Unionists, and a considerable number of idle and ineffective Unionists, who follow no trade and engage in no public or private work at all. We have Liberals who favour the Budget. We have a Liberal "Cave" who oppose the Budget. We have Liberals who are uncertain about the Budget. We have Liberal Imperialists, and Liberal anti-Imperialists. We have a Labour Party, an Independent



Labour Party, a Social Democratic Federation. We have Confederates, Moderates, and Progressives. We have Socialists who read the *Clarion* and Socialists who read the *Christian Commonwealth*. We have also a vast host—larger, perhaps, than Lord Rosebery imagines—who follow, like himself, a lonely furrow, waiting for the Orator of the Empire to sing to Britain and the Dominions—

“If I could plant a tiny seed of love  
In the garden of your heart.”

Now, some of the above parties are poor. Others are rich, can placard the streets, possess much chinkling “brass,” and, on party fête days, many tinkling cymbals. But the vast majority of them represent sections of the Nation organized for individual self-interest. And what we surely want is a Corporation which represents all who care for their country, organized for that Love, which “suffereth long and is kind, which envieth not, which vaunteth not itself, is not puffed up”—that Love which “never fails.”

It follows that, to such a crowd of clashing cliques, there surely comes a message, that, as regards Social Reform, they must, while making the Banks their outposts, fall back upon the Home—that backbone of our civilization—as a tested strategic base, which they can unhesitatingly trust, and which they can make the basis of future social operations. And that message is one, which the Spirit of Historic

Truth, and the Star of our Racial Destiny, commands them to obey. For these political reformers must assuredly understand that we have come to the end of a great epoch, that the untenable valley of Protestant Individualism where they quarrel, is dominated on all sides by the irresistible Artillery of Historic Truth, and that no "terminological inexactitudes" will ever enable them to escape from the irresistible logic of irrefutable fact.

"They can go whither they please,  
They can skid up the trees !  
But they can't get away from the guns."

#### COMPLICATED CHARACTER OF POLITICAL ATTEMPTS AT SOCIAL REFORM.

Ungracious as it must seem, it is here necessary once more to emphasise the incoherent and complicated character, of all purely political attempts at Social Reform.

Take for instance, Tariff Reform. As I have endeavoured to show, a Neo-Catholic conception of statesmanship, would favour it, provided that all those masters and men who receive a monopoly from their trusting fellow-countrymen, give, or bequeath, those parts of their fortunes, or weekly wages, (which are due, not to their own individualistic exertion, but to unearned increment in the form of a monopoly which they get from the rest of their trusting countrymen) to a Neo - Catholic Corporation. But while I am confident that such Neo-Catholic

Tariff Reform, has unquestioned advantages, because it can eliminate competition, in the form of underpaid foreign labour, purely political Tariff Reform will merely give employment. It will do nothing to solve the Housing Problem, and it will create unearned increment of a most questionable character.

Rents are settled by competition, and if political Tariff Reform gives employment, and in some instances, higher and more certain wages—both of which I believe it will do—there is no guarantee, whatever, that working class rents will not, in consequence, rise with increased wages. I have poured what has, I trust, been regarded as kindly, and not malicious, ridicule on Mr. Runciman's amphitheatre "turns," and Mr. Lloyd George's haste in ignoring the principle of voluntary benevolence. It is therefore only just to point out the equally hasty and unsocial nature of the "ideals" of those political Tariff Reformers who promise "employment" as if that were all that should be done for the degraded.

We hear that Protection secures a steady wage for the American working man. But it does nothing to keep working-class rents in New York at a righteous level: nor will it in London, Manchester, Bristol, etc., prevent callous employers from paying unjust wages to seamstresses, or prevent a working man from blowing away his increased wages on beer. The only policy that will do justice to the mothers and children of this country, who belong to the submerged tenth, is a Neo-Catholic Corporation

(composed of all those who love their fellows) which owns their homes.

With such a practical, propertied Church for their Landlord all the women who, to-day, live in garrets, and work their fingers to the bones to get a few shillings a week—a quarter, or a third, of which they pay away in rent—will find themselves, within a few years' time—if such a Church becomes their Landlord—in a totally new position.

For such a Corporation will not merely secure them a just rent. It will further secure them a living wage, by going straight to the Bank, which finances their employer—and where, by the way, the Church Corporation's own funds will be deposited — and asking those Bankers, as men of honour, and sportsmen, to exercise that vast influence which every Bank-Manager, in every town, can unquestionably exercise over his clients, in favour of a just living wage being given to those poorer British sisters of ours.

NEO-CATHOLICISM WILL STRENGTHEN THAT NATIONAL CREDIT WHICH SO-CALLED REFORMERS WHO RELY ON STATE FORCE DO SO MUCH TO WEAKEN.

And here, in passing, I must observe that, inasmuch as this Neo-Catholic Corporation will consist of those who love *all* their fellow-citizens, the rich no less than the poor, it will, on such occasions, adopt devices which will make this country a far safer place for all honourable investments, than

Britain will ever conceivably be, so long as we follow the existing device of leaving Social Reform to politicians who believe in Force. For too many of these politicians are Lawyers and Journalists, rather than business men, and too many of them rely on State-Force, and upon their ability to appeal to the passions of the poorer sections of the Nation, rather than to Love and the practical common-sense of those classes in this great business community, whose wisdom and intelligence can alone uplift the degraded, on lines which will be both honourable and safe.

THE TRUE SOCIAL REFORMER MUST LOVE THE RICH AS  
WELL AS THE POOR.

A system of Social Reform, conducted on these social Christ-like lines, is surely the kind of thing that is wanted! It is recorded in the New Testament that Christ told a rich young ruler to sell all that he had, and give to the poor. It is also added that Christ, when He saw him, loved him. If those who claim to be Social Reformers would only recognise that the excessively wealthy are often in as much need of pity as are many of the poor, a world of trouble would surely be saved.

From this point of view, we are, surely, in the direst need of something in the nature of a modernized Franciscan Movement, in favour of simplicity and frugality. The wasteful extravagance, and senseless ostentation displayed by the abnormally



wealthy—when the poor—many of whom are, naturally, quite as clever and capable as the rich—are starving, indeed points to the need for potent religious Reformers to arise, who shall both practice and preach the gospel of self-sacrifice to us all. The speeches of the bulk of recent so-called Social Reformers in Parliament, have been couched in such materialistic language, and the system of placing vast sums in the hands of Force-worshipping politicians, with which they may, directly or indirectly, bribe the Electorate (as both parties did in the case of that hastily-devised Old-Age Pensions Bill) is so decadent that I have felt constrained to speak with scorn of a recent Budget. But it must be confessed that too many Conservatives who have defended the Social Organism as it stands to-day, have filled the newspapers with glittering nullities, and do not really represent the views of Conservatives who stay at home and think. One citizen declares that, if his income is lessened, he must dismiss one of his six flunkies: another, that she will have to dismiss her “maid.” It never seems to occur to such tragic triflers that an idle woman of leisure, who has ample time to “do her hair,” is in a far less need of a personal attendant than is a mother who goes out charring from 7 a.m. to 4 p.m., and then has to get her husband’s supper, and bath her baby. Nor do such persons note that unemployment in Turkey has not increased because Abdul Hamid no longer spends £3,000,000 per annum on his harem. His

late attendants have merely turned their attention to nobler forms of employment than waiting on a re-actionary Xerxes.

That great Elizabethan philosopher, Bacon, used to say that "money is like muck, no good except it be spread"; and the more justly, within common-sense limits, wealth is spread—*by the Church*—throughout the community, on lines which reward talent and "let the runagate continue in scarceness," the less chance there is that, before the end of the century, the whole of our foreign trade with the East, will not be "bagged" by America—where class distinctions are practically non-existent.

With foreign competition as it is, we cannot, obviously, house and educate all classes too well! I admit fully—no one more so—the evil of educating dull-heads above their *natural* station. But it is alas! true that there are too many rich dull-heads now receiving the benefits of a costly University and Public School education, who are intellectually speaking, only fit to plough the fields, or mend clogs.\* That is true: and it is high time someone said it. For, if the need for re-organizing our scholarship system is not fully recognised, Germany,

---

\* "France possesses very clever practical men; the only thing necessary is to find them, and to give them the means of reaching the proper station: such an one is at the plough who ought to be in the council; and such another is minister, who ought to be at the plough."—

NAPOLÉON.

America, and those younger Countries, where larger opportunities of acquiring knowledge, are given to all classes, will knock us out of the ring of Civilization. For they will have educated all their clever sons, whereas we allow too many of ours no proper education, and hence the crude ideals of too many of our Labour Members.

It will, perhaps, be said that such truths come ill from one who is a Tory. But the Tory Party dates back to William the Conqueror, whose grandfather was a Tanner ; and the need of this generation is not a Plutocracy, but an Aristocracy of Talent—like that which accompanied the Conqueror to these shores, and goaded the sleepy Anglo-Saxon into activity.

Because, however, this is true, it does not follow that politicians are the people to spread wealth and use it as electoral jam rather than moral manure. The question must surely be settled (as it was under William the Conqueror's régime) by a Catholicism which has done the task before—but a Catholicism of a modernized kind. For it must be a Catholicism which can awe the crowd, can discipline the degraded, and console the wealthy with the sure guarantee that every gift to the Treasury of the Church will be controlled by men who are jealous for the honour of Britannia ; by men whose watch-words are spiritual faith, moral endeavour, industrial efficiency, and social peace ; by men who would fain

save their country from sinking from a first-class into a second-class power. For it is the spiritual and moral power of Neo-Catholicism which can, alone, rejuvenate old John Bull; can teach our somewhat hasty critics that, if he is to go down, it shall be with his back to the wall, and shall show that, for all that some may jeer, it will still be his proud prerogative to be the Constitutional Leader of Humanity.

BY BECOMING EXCLUSIVELY RESPONSIBLE FOR SOCIAL REFORM, A NEO-CATHOLIC CORPORATION WILL ENABLE US TO GET OUR FINANCES AT WESTMINSTER INTO SOMETHING APPROACHING ORDER.

Remembering that such a Neo-Catholic Corporation will eventually devote both its rents and the interest on its shares to financing Education, and reducing Education rates, such a Neo-Catholic Corporation will give us some chance of getting our National Finances into order.

If we continue on the principle that Social Reform must be financed from Westminster, how, in the name of business sanity, can we ever hope to do this! A system under which Parliament has to find money, not merely for Imperial Defence, Education, and Old Age Pensions—but for dealing with the *minutiae* of poverty, can only lead, ultimately, to a Military Dictatorship.

## BURKE'S WARNING.

This is surely no exaggeration. For it was exactly this abnormal centralization of all power in the Lower House which was responsible for the French Revolution. Napoleon himself, in a conversation at St. Helena, has left it on record that had France maintained her old two-decker Constitution, at that crisis in her history, the need for a military Dictator would never have arisen. And in his *French Revolution*, Burke has described a state of affairs existing in revolutionary Paris, which, as everyone knows, has been responsible for transforming France from a first-class into a second-class power. What he says bears directly on the issue before the country at the present time, if the country does not develop the social power of the Church and persists in allowing the House of Commons, and London, to undertake, by Force and Centralisation, social tasks for which they are unfitted.

“The power of the city of Paris,” wrote Burke, “is evidently one great spring of all their politics. It is through the power of Paris, now become the centre and focus of jobbing, that the leaders of this faction direct, or rather command, the whole legislative and the whole Executive Government. . . The other divisions of the kingdom being hackled and torn to pieces, and separated from all their habitual means, and even principles of union, cannot, for some time at least, confederate against her.”



“To a person,” continues Burke, “who takes a view of the whole, the strength of Paris, thus formed, will appear a system of general weakness. It is boasted that the geometrical policy has been adopted, that all local ideas should be sunk, and that the people should be no longer Gascons, Picards, Bretons, Normans; but Frenchmen, with one country, one heart, and one Assembly. But instead of being all Frenchmen, the greater likelihood is, that the inhabitants of that region will shortly have no country. No man ever was attached by a sense of pride, partiality, or real affection, to a description of square measurements. He never will glory in belonging to the Chequer No. 71, or to any other badge-ticket. We begin our public affections in our families.”

Now surely Burke was right! You may give the old people geometrical Post Office Pensions, and keep their names and numbers at Westminster. You may establish Labour Bureaux, and dole out State-paid work to A27 or B2005. But you will never get to the root of the problems of poverty until your policy is devolutionary, and until a Church, which does justice to the poor in the matter of rents, and which guarantees just wages to the industrious, also keeps up the family tie, insists that sons and daughters in receipt of decent wages keep the old folk by the fireside, and that justice has been done, by the Church, so fully and squarely, that there shall be no need—as alas! there is at present, in too

many a home—for the flag of a family's honour to be stained by a Treasury dole.

THE LATE LORD SALISBURY OF FINANCIAL  
CENTRALISATION

In *Efficiency and Empire*, Mr. Arnold White has referred to an occasion, in 1900, when the late Lord Salisbury observed of the Treasury: "I say that the exercise of its powers in governing other departments of the Government is not for the public benefit."

This observation resulted in the resignation of Sir Francis Mowatt, Permanent Secretary to the Treasury, and Lord Salisbury withdrew the imputation. The Nation is all too slow to recognise all that she owes to her Civil Servants, who toil in obscurity as the henchmen of popular politicians. One can, however, submit—without the remotest imputation against permanent officials—that the load of responsibility which they will soon be asked to bear, will be such as, in their own interests, they are scarcely likely to desire.

*Devolution* and the removal of responsibility for social ills from Parliament, which will throw straight on to the broad backs of the wealthy the responsibility of providing efficient *homes* for the casual labourer, is surely what is required.

*For the biggest burden should unquestionably be put on the broadest back. But not by jam-spreading poli-*

*ticians, who invite the Crowd to jeer at the rich, and weaken the National Credit.* It must rather be placed on the broadest backs by a Church which relies on Love, whose yoke is easy, and whose burden is light. It is surely for the Church—organized on Neo-Catholic lines—to remind the wealthy of their responsibilities. It is surely for the Mothers of Britain to ask that the homes of their poorer sisters should be such as a wealthy man would not be ashamed for his own wife and children to occupy, if *he* came down in the world.

Working on such lines, any self-sacrifice which is asked of the wealthy, will not “leave behind it”—to use a favourite phrase of the late Lord Salisbury’s—“any bitterness or any sting”: and will be accepted as what is due from one fellow-Briton to another fellow-Briton and his family.

#### ROUGH ESTIMATE OF COST.

It was estimated at the last census that 2,500,000 people lived in crowded tenancies. Let us go further and assume that, to do full justice, 10,000,000 persons require efficient homes—that each home costs, including the clearing of fresh open spaces, £250, and that five persons occupy each home.

Assuming the utmost, what does this amount to? It implies that 2,000,000 homes will have, during the next ten years, to be (*a*) acquired by voluntary gifts, and rents reduced to a righteous level: (*b*) that new

houses will have to be erected at fresh suburban sites—or deserted middle-class dwellings converted into Neo-Catholic Flats. The total to be raised would be £250,000,000 or about the cost of the South African war.

“Ah!” you will say, “that is an impossible sum to raise by Love.” If, however, you will only reflect that, what we want is a *Twentieth Century Reformation—covering ten years*—only £25,000,000 will have to be raised voluntarily every year. And that, you will remember, is less than we give already voluntarily in coin, in the form of charities, every year. It is therefore manifest that, while fully doing justice to worthy existing charitable Institutions, such as Almshouses and Orphanages, we have, without any silly appeals to class hatred at all, merely to make our annual voluntary gifts every year tot up to £40,000,000, and then we shall be perfectly safe, and have ample for making the Home the basis of Social Reform.

If it is further remembered that this sum will not have to be raised in the form of coin, but, while partly in cash, very largely in the form of definite gifts of buildings, and of land, it is surely not unreasonable to hope that, with a quickening of big voluntary endowments at death, such as fall in every year, we can well raise the £40,000,000 per annum.

## A SPORTING POLICY.

Now, £40,000,000 happens to be the very sum which, staticians tell us, we spend annually on sport.

Is not this a happy augury, and is it wholly unfair to submit that such a home-building policy as I have outlined is, in the best sense of a much-abused word, a sporting policy, which should appeal to a Nation, who are, above all things, a Nation of sportsmen?

Nearly two-thousand years ago St. Paul laid down the first motto of all genuine sportsmen, when he said: "Now we that are strong ought to help the weak, and not to please ourselves." And if, for doing justice to our weaker brothers and sisters, we cannot, by cutting down expenses on needless luxuries, contribute each as much (in the form of land, houses and cash) as we now spend annually on our very dogs and hunters, our cricket, our football, and our racehorses, which amounts, if you will reckon it out—to but £1 per head of the population per annum, and which is merely a quarter of the £150,000,000 which we spend annually on alcohol—if, I say, gentlemen, the descendants of the men who united to defeat the Armada, have come to this—

But why continue? Can any but a cur believe that his fellow-Britons are such mean-spirited poltroons as that? Surely, as was urged in an earlier chapter, the weakness of the existing situation is simply and solely that we have come to the end of



an epoch devoted to the pursuit of a needful Individual Liberty; and have, in consequence, lost—temporarily—the art of co-operating together. That is all. It is nothing more. There is no earthly cause for alarm: there is no earthly need for a constitutional crisis. There is no earthly need for lugubrious legislation. All we have to do, to house the Nation properly, is to spend a quarter of the amount we now spend on drink, on voluntary benevolence; but instead of, as at present, wasting such benevolence on over-lapping charities, make it scientific.

#### A BRIEF SURVEY OF HISTORY.

Looking back over history to the destruction, at the Reformation, of Corporate Property, it is at once sad and ludicrous to consider the unscientific waste—not merely of the millions squandered, in the form of voluntary charities, but also of the money raised by State-Force, in the form of that Poor Law which began in the reign of Queen Elizabeth. Of late years, the Poor Law has spent from £15,000,000 to £20,000,000 every year to atone to the poorest of the poor for their low wages and high rents. If Parliament had handed these sums over to a disciplinary, home-acquiring, Neo-Catholic Corporation instead of devoting them to the up-keep of work-houses, these sums would, long ago, have secured efficient housing to all classes and justice to the woman-worker. While, if the sum of merely 2½ millions per annum had been devoted—since the

Reformation—towards building Church houses for the casual labourer, the Church would to-day—interest excluded—possess working-class house property equal in amount to the National Debt.

From this—the economic point of view—anti-corporate Liberalism, alas! comes out badly; and Mr. Cecil Chesterton—a Socialist—author of *Gladstonian Ghosts*, is surely right in asking Socialists in the country what on earth they have in common with destructive Liberalism.

“Look,” cries this Socialist writer, “at the track of Liberalism across English history. It begins practically with the Reformation and the Great Pillage, wherein it showed its true character very vividly in the combination of a strictly individualistic religion with the conversion of communal property into private property for the benefit of the new “Reforming” oligarchs. Then it appears in the Civil War, which we are beginning to understand better than the Whig historians of the late century understood it. On its economic side Puritanism was the seventeenth century counterpart of Cobdenism—a middle-class movement striking at once at the old aristocracy, whose lands it confiscated and divided, and at the proletariat, whom it robbed of what was left of their common heritage, and to whom it denied their traditional holidays, avowedly on religious grounds, but practically in the interests of the employing class. One could continue the story further if it were necessary. But

all that need be said is that in the middle of the nineteenth century we find Liberalism everywhere dominant and victorious with the result that Englishmen had practically ceased to form a community at all."

VIRTUAL ACKNOWLEDGMENT, ON THE PART OF LIBERALS THEMSELVES, OF THE NEED FOR NEW LAY-CONTROLLED CHURCH ENDOWMENTS, AND CONSEQUENT NEED FOR PEACE.

While this is true of the old Liberalism, it need scarcely be said that, by their advocacy of Socialism, Nonconformists themselves are confessing to-day that an old epoch is wound up, and that anti-corporate Protestantism has achieved its ends. How such persons propose to re-create corporate property, except by appeals to Christian generosity, is hard to understand. Similarly, how attempts to tax—not incomes—but capital, and convert capital into current coin for politicians to play with, will assist practical Socialists to nationalize even a fraction of either land or capital, is hard to understand.

There is not, I believe, a single member in the Conservative Party who would object to an increase in corporate Church endowments, on the pacific lines indicated above: and it surely follows that the comradeship, of which Socialists talk so much, will best be displayed if both they and their new Liberal allies will only show just a little more faith in voluntary generosity, and will stop those threats to achieve, through a Social Revolution and State-force,

what can—as we have seen—be achieved, with such comparative ease, through a Twentieth Century Reformation and Love. That the large number of Christian Socialists who have read some of Mrs. Annie Besant's gentle lectures on Christ-like social reform in the *Christian Commonwealth*, will agree with this view, I am quietly assured.

Let them do that, and those who care for the Nation, though for the moment they may be inclined to smile at Mr. Lloyd George, will pay him that eternal tribute which such men pay those who serve Britannia. For, when the din of controversy has died away, it will be remembered that, when a Neo-Catholic Corporation was established in every town and village of our land, there were many callous wealthy persons whose contributions *in* Church—so to speak—towards making the Home the basis of Social Reform, were quickened by the remembrance that, *outside* the Church door, stood Lloyd George, the Last of the Barons, a Liberal Dentist\* whose amazing lack of faith in Love and in the voluntary generosity of his fellows, was adequately atoned for by the possession of a pair of State pincers, and an old-world conviction that the human jaw was the sole vehicle of progress.

---

\* See page 176.

CHAPTER XI.  
STATE AND CHURCH:  
OR  
EXIT THE ROUNDHEADS.

“Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar’s, and unto God the things that are God’s.”

Important as is Neo-Catholicism for social ends at home, the advantage of a strong Neo-Catholicism to assist our relations with other countries is equally cogent. Indeed, it is not until we turn to the region of European and Asiatic politics, that the absence of a powerful International Church, attuned to the needs of the age, becomes fully apparent. And the International achievements of the old Catholicism, down to 1400, give us a sure key to the ultimate trend of events.

STRAINED RELATIONS BETWEEN CIVILIZED NATIONS  
DUE TO THE ABSENCE OF A MODERNIZED INTERNATIONAL  
CATHOLICISM.

In the first place, we are now in a position to understand that the strained relations which exist between modern Nations are due, almost entirely,



to the absence of a powerful International Church, attuned to the spirit of the age, accepting the Liberal principle of spiritual freedom, and intellectual tolerance, but insisting on the need for moral unity among Churchmen, throughout Christendom, on matters vital to the progress of Western civilization, and to its moral responsibilities towards the East. For, in Catholic-feudal times, when such an International Church existed, in keeping with mediæval conditions, the Church was—relative to the awful barbarism of the age—a potent factor in the cause of International Peace, crude social service, and inter-communication between Nations.

It is, I know, the current opinion of the "Man in the Street," that Christianity has been responsible for as many wars as Paganism. That, however, is simply not true; and such a view is only held by those who study history from 1500 onwards, but ignore the achievements of history from 1 A.D. to 1500.

The truth is, that in the sixteenth century, and the early half of the seventeenth century, when Kings hastily undertook the functions of a Church which they had despoiled, religious wars, of a re-actionary character, were waged between the superstitious and wealthy Catholic South and the Protestant North, by Southern zealots, like Philip II. of Spain, with a view to promoting religious unity, in intellectual matters, by force. With the exception of these comparatively brief, and re-actionary, wars, there are

no wars associated with Christianity, except the Crusades which were essential because, but for the Crusades, and the earlier achievements of Charles the Hammer, at Tours, in 732, A.D., Europe would have been overrun by the Mohammedans.

What they forget who, on the strength of the Crusades and the re-actionary wars, above mentioned, assert that the Church has been responsible for wars is, that it is to the Church that we owe the possibilities of Modern Civilization at all. Far from being the cause of wars, it was the Church which, throughout the Middle Ages, mitigated the severity of war—when war was the daily occupation of our ancestors—by preventing men from fighting on the numerous Holy days, when she compelled warriors to recognise what was called a “Truce of God,” and by offering sanctuary to non-combatants in Churches and Monasteries.

Not less marvellous, in those brutal times, was the fact that—thanks to the Church, and the Church alone—scholars throughout Europe communicated with each other in Latin; and that, thanks to the Church, Englishmen held Church benefices in Italy, France, and Germany, and Germans, French and Italians held benefices in Britain.

#### THE RETURN OF AN INTERNATIONAL CHURCH.

While, therefore, there are those who will smile if I submit that we are on the eve of the re-establishment of an International, as well as a National,

Neo-Catholicism for the promotion, among other things, of international peace, those acquainted with history must inevitably know that, what the Church and the moral principle once did, the Church and the moral principle can do again, though in keeping with the spirit of the age, which will never again allow the Church to fetter the human intellect.

Take, for instance, the case of the relations between Britain and Germany, and you will perceive, at once, that the establishment of such an International Church is as inevitable as the Law of Gravitation, in accordance with which our planet moves. Accept the most materialistic view you choose of the relations between these two countries, you must admit that, if we, in Britain and America, establish Neo-Catholic Institutions, and solve our social problems by voluntary benevolence, we shall be in a position to reserve, if need be, almost the whole energy of the Empire, and taxation, for national defence. Mark what follows! For, with unerring certainty it *must* follow that even the war party, let alone the altruists, in Germany, will advocate the establishment, there also, of a Neo-Catholic Corporation, on similar lines, which will leave the German "State" also free to attend to nothing but national defence.

This granted—and I do not see how you can do otherwise than grant it—it must surely be remembered that those who are foremost in giving voluntary

gifts to make Neo-Catholic Corporations, in both Britain and Germany, as powerful—morally—as is, humanly speaking, possible—will be opposed to the idea of war in Europe, or indeed, anywhere where it can be helped. They will, therefore, knit their respective Neo-Catholic Corporations together; and in proportion as Neo-Catholic wealth increases, and the Church acquires a strong grip over newspapers and the Stock Exchange—both of which she will, by the end of the century, as scientific benevolence increases—just so far, and no farther, will she be able to eliminate war in the West.

#### THE ETERNAL NEED FOR A REASONABLY MARTIAL SPIRIT.

This does not, however, imply any large reduction of Armaments, or any diminution of a self-controlled martial spirit in either Germany, Britain, or France, or America. For the economic development of the East, in the near future, and the consequent expansion of population which will ensue in China, Japan, and India, will transform the problems which confront Western Europe to-day, into the broad issue of the ability of this section of the globe to play a worthy part against the competition—industrial and strategic—of both America and the East. And to that end military discipline will be a fundamental, though not an exaggerated element, in the Education of our youth.



THE FOUNDER OF THE CHURCH AND STATE  
PRINCIPLE.

Before proceeding further it will be necessary to glance back, briefly, over history, and note the attitude of the Founder of Christianity towards "the State."

For, as those who decline to study the career of Jesus Christ, in the light of His contemporaries, fail to recognise, it was His triumph, as a statesman, no less than a prophet, that He rejected the idea of "the State" as an altruistic Institution for promoting morality by force, and amphitheatre devices, but accepted it for what it was and is: a crude instrument for the maintenance of order, the promotion of a needful self-assertion, and of the principle of leadership by the fittest.

In other words—unlike his contemporary Mahomet, and European statecraft since the Reformation—the Founder of Christianity differentiated between those ends which can only be achieved by State compulsion and those which can be achieved by persuasion and Love. He conceived, that is to say, the idea of a *Church*—a wealth-owning Kingdom within "the State"—which, unlike earthly States, relies for its weapons on moral and spiritual appeals. At the same time, while denying the use of the sword to the Church, as a weapon for promoting (Mohammedan) morality, he accepted the sword, in the shape of the Roman State of His



time, to which he bade his followers pay tribute, and with whose troops he fraternized.

In keeping, that is to say, with the bedrock principles of Science, the Founder of Christianity observed in man two principles—the self-preservative, or force, principle, which he found embodied in the Roman “State,” and in the law of leadership by the fittest (“arms and the man”—the tools to him that can use them)—and the altruistic, or self-sacrificing, principle, which he himself embodied in his Church; and in those methods of promoting moral advance by persuasion and Love advocated in these pages,\* as necessary to solve social ills.

From the fact that he was the first fully to emphasise the need for altruism, self-sacrifice, and wise humility, we are, to-day, apt to forget that no man born of woman was—when necessary—more self-assertive than the Founder of Christianity. We talk too much, now-a-days, as if the being whom the average Jew of his time wanted to crown as physical King of Galilee, was a kind of knock-kneed altruist, who would, under no circumstances, knock anyone down. We forget the Jesus who, in youth, went into the Temple with a scourge of small cords, and drove its inhabitants out by physical force. And when we read the story of the Temptation in the Wilderness, we fail to read that account in the light of history, and consider the vast mental conflict waged in Christ’s breast, which resulted in the estab-

---

\* See Chapter IV. Section I.

lishment of a kingdom within "the State," rather than of a physical Empire.

We forget that—as the story of the Temptation in the Wilderness tells us—there existed in the Founder of Christendom that large imagination—that indifference to the Crowd—that readiness to risk—which tempted him sorely in his passionate youth, if the Temptation in the Wilderness means anything; to anticipate Mahomet by four hundred years, by making himself a physical King, and establishing—as did Mahomet—a Semitic Empire, stretching from Judea to Spain.

Because the Founder of Christendom, after long mental conflict, threw in his lot with the Romans and Western Civilization, rejected the Mohammedan dream of becoming an Eastern Potentate, and came to the conclusion that what the world wanted, at the time when he was born, was not a Semitic Empire, but a Church; a "State" within "the State," a kingdom not of this world, which did not tax, but by moral devices took to itself friends of the mammon of unrighteousness and moralized wealth, we surely forget that, though kept under magnificent control, there existed in the Founder of Christendom, an abundance of physical strength, as well as moral courage, a Napoleonic intellect, and an ability—when needful—to impress his personality, and the principles he embodied, on his age, with an imperious authority which has outlived the conquests of the Kings.

To sum up, he came not to destroy the stable military discipline of the Roman State, but to fulfil, or supplement, it with a revelation of man's spiritual and moral destiny. Unless Heaven's revelation, through history, of the progressive development of man, is a hollow mockery, it follows that the ideal character of the future—the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ—will be one which will be—as was Christ's—complete physically and mentally, as well as morally and spiritually, and will comprise self-assertion as well as self-repression. It also follows that, while his Church is destined to stand for moral courage, altruism and self-abnegation, it is the no less necessary function of the State to keep alive—though not over-emphasise—physical courage, and to give reasonable play to the principle of leadership by the fittest.

Speaking broadly, may I repeat, there are two principles running through scientific history from the earliest days—the self-assertive principle, and the self-denying principle. And both of these principles must co-exist in a Nation which would be secure and progressive: Force being embodied in the “State,” and Love in the Church. It was thus—throughout Western Europe—from the coming of Christ down to the Reformation. Men served the Spiritual and the Moral Principle through the Church. They served Cæsar and the principle of leadership by the fittest—“the tools of him that can use them,” “arms and the man”—through the State.

It was, however, the inevitable temporary misfortune of Western Civilization that, after succeeding for fifteen centuries, this dual State and Church system was interrupted—*i.e.* from the Reformation down to the present time. It has been the object of the present volume to shew, after being temporarily abandoned, at the Reformation, the twofold Church and State principle must be resuscitated, though on modernized lines, which concede the principle that the Church's policy, on moral and economic matters, is controlled by carefully-selected Laymen, as well as ordained Clergy.

WHY THE TWOFOLD CHURCH AND STATE PRINCIPLE  
BROKE DOWN IN THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY.

As to the reasons why, after doing such noble service for fifteen centuries, the dual Church and State system had to be temporarily abandoned, I can only speak briefly in the present volume. Suffice it to say, that the real trouble arose from the fact that the Church's corporate organization had become centralized in a superstitious southern city—Rome—where, in due course of time, the chief Church administrators—the Popes—got hopelessly out of touch with the progressive North of Europe. For, at the Reformation, it was a common saying in Europe: "All evil comes from Spain, all good from the North."\*

---

\* According to Sir Thomas Challoner, writing from Florence in 1597, this was then "a common proverb in



After slowly opening, it was not until the Reformation that a temporarily unfathomable gulf opened out between the South of Europe and the North. Then it was that, with awful impiety, the Popes forgot the bedrock principles of the Founder of the Church, threw in their lot—*not*, as did Christ, with the most progressive section of the globe—but with that Southern Peninsula, which had been, up to the time of Ferdinand and Isabella, dominated by the Mohammedan Moors—armed the Church with the State sword of Spain, and endeavoured to heal the intellectual breach between South and North by letting loose the legions of Alva upon the Netherlands, and sending the galleons of Phillip II. against these sea-girt Isles.

With the result of that senseless step, Europe, and to some extent America, has resounded for three centuries during which the main issue of the relative functions of Church and State has been lost sight of. And it is not until to-day that in Britain, Germany, France, America, and Australia, we Protestants are in a position to look back over the history of Western Civilization, with cool, unprejudiced, eyes, and recognise that the abuse of the dual Church and

---

every man's mouth."—"Notes and Queries," 10th Ser., Vol. 2, 23.)

For the close connection which exists between superstition and volcanic Southern countries, where Nature creates an undue sense of fear, see Buckle's *History of Civilization*, Chap. XI.



State principle at the hands of southern Popes, does not, at all, prove the fallacy of the Church and State principle, but merely our inability to work it during an epoch of transition—1550 to 1900—during which men's ideas as to the functions of the Church have been undergoing a needful change.

#### THE DAWN OF THE NEW CATHOLICISM.

To-day, however, in Britain, Germany, France, America, and Australia, the phenomenon known as Socialism, and those forces which are unanimously making for social advance, on hopelessly divergent and inconsistent lines, point, with irresistible emphasis, to the need for a disciplinary Neo-Catholicism. For the State is everywhere attempting to chew more than it can swallow; taxation, as a system of raising revenue for education and social ends, is breaking down in every country of Europe, and there is an urgent need for a modernized return to that twofold Church and State regime which we now understand was only temporarily abandoned for a few "protesting" centuries.

From this point of view, the history of the nineteenth century was the history of the unconscious dawn of Neo-Catholicism. The Rev. Dr. Chalmers, of Glasgow, by rejecting Parliamentary Poor Relief, and relying entirely upon voluntary Church benevolence in his Parish, was the first being in Britain, with enough faith in voluntary benevolence and social discipline, to put Neo-Catholicism into prac-

tice, as regards social matters. Lord Beaconsfield, on the other hand, came nearer than anyone else to gripping the inevitable return of the principle of Church endowments, controlled by the Laity, and paying financial homage to neither Popes nor Priests. His private correspondence has not yet been published, and it is, therefore, impossible to know how far he may, in his heart of hearts, have foreseen the end. To judge from his public speeches and novels, it would appear that the historical data at his command, the spirit of the age, and the curious Romeward movement inaugurated by Newman, resulted in Lord Beaconsfield supposing, with his contemporaries, that the practical re-union of Christendom would be effected from Rome, rather than, as will probably be the case, from America.

For, near as Lord Beaconsfield came to discerning that beyond the smoke-line of a Machine Civilization, there lay a Neo-Catholic "Atlantis," the fatal fascination, which the past achievements of the Roman Empire, and the Roman Church, exercised over his mind, prevented him, no less than his contemporaries, from ever allowing his Catholic barque to sail out of sight of the Mediterranean, and the City of the Seven Hills.

#### THE SOLITARY CAREER OF DISRAELI.

It followed that the career of Lord Beaconsfield, was, in the main, political. Born in the revolutionary Epoch of Napoleon, under the sway of the

Napoleonic ideal of the career opened to talent, it was the lot of "Dizzy" to be a man of the world, who served his Church. It was his to leave behind him the record of one who, though usually accused of ministering mainly to personal ambition, threw in his lot with the Tory Party when it was leaderless, unpopular and disheartened. It was his lonesome task to educate the Party which he joined : to make the term "Tory" synonymous with "*noblesse oblige*" and honour : to lend stability to the State, by preserving a fitting balance between two great political parties : to direct the attention of posterity to the social achievements of the mediæval Church, and, by Neo-Catholic devices, too numerous to mention, quicken the arrival of a day, when, as he predicted, "the Spirit of Progress, supposed to be so characteristic of our age, will only lead men back to old ideas in the end."

MILTON, BURKE, BAGEHOT, AND DEAN HOLE SUPPORT  
DISRAELI.

Solitary as was the lot of Disraeli, his instinctive faith in the ultimate return of the Church was not the faith of a single man. For, when Disraeli declared that "the Church was one of the few great things left," and that, "when the deluge was over, the Ark would be found floating on the top of the water," his spirit was holding unconscious communion with the mighty dead, and with the more penetrating among his contemporaries. I have

quoted earlier from Burke's lofty defence of Church endowments, and could quote many passages, from other portions of his works, to flank my contention. I prefer to remind Puritan readers, that the great John Milton was one of the earliest to recognise the evils of a conception of religion, which laid abnormal stress on faith and religious oratory at the expense of works.

"The light," cried Milton, speaking of the Reformation, "which we have gained was given us, not to be ever staring on, but by it to discover onward things more remote from our knowledge. It is not the unfrocking of a priest, the unmitring of a bishop, and the removing him from off the Presbyterian shoulders, that will make us a happy nation: no, if other things as great in the Church, and in the rule of life both economical and political, be not looked into and reformed, we have looked so long upon the blaze that Zuinglius and Calvin have beacons up to us, that we are stark blind."\*

Turning from Milton and Burke to Disraeli's contemporaries, I would refer the reader to a remarkable passage in the *Memoirs* of the late Dean Hole. Speaking of the quasi-revolutionary epoch of the Reform Bill of 1832, and of the Chartist Movement, the late Dean Hole observed:—

"I know that we were living in the lull which

---

\* Milton's *Areopagitica*.



precedes the storm, and the big drops, which have been described as the tears of the tempest, weeping for the havoc it will make, began at intervals to fall. I believe that the thunder-clouds then gathering on the horizon had never darkened day if the Church had done her duty ; if her rich laity, her nobles, squires, and merchants, had been more thoughtful and more generous as to the spiritual and temporal condition of the people ; if the welfare of the mechanic and the labourer had been studied and promoted by Christian sympathy, instead of by politicians, fighting for place, and outbidding one another with promises to the electors of a beneficence which, if ever realized, will cost them personally nothing. If the subjects of education, dwellings, allotments, trades unions, labour and capital, had been dealt with in a religious, philanthropic spirit, instead of being pressed upon Parliament, and if that Parliament had never been, as Charles Dickens, who watched its proceedings for three and a half years, described it, a place in which ‘ Britannia was brought out night after night to be roasted, like a trussed fowl, skewered with office pens, and tied up with red tape ; a place in which he listened to promises which were not intended for fulfilment, and to explanations which only tended to mystify, which constrained him to declare with regard to patriotism, ‘ I am an infidel and shall never be converted ’ ” —why, then there might have been confidence instead of suspicion, men of all ranks might have



met each other in the streets with the smiles of sympathy instead of with the scowl of aversion, and owners might have gone into factory and field, as Boaz went among his harvesters, with a "Lord be with you!" and been answered with "The Lord bless thee!" (From the *Memoirs of Dean Hole*, Chap. XI.).

Was Dean Hole so wrong, and is it not high time, for many who are not now in communion with any Church, to recognise that it is in a Neo-Catholic conception of the functions of the Church, rather than in these politicians, who toady to the Crowd, that genuine Social Reformers must put their trust?

Lastly, may I remind Liberal readers, once more, of how, in his essay on Mr. Gladstone, Walter Bagehot, himself a Liberal, declared :—

"We have now reached the end of the destructive period. . . . The questions which remain are questions of construction. . . and on these the voice of the nation will never be very distinct. Destruction is easy, construction is very difficult. A statesman who will hereafter learn what our real public opinion is, will not have to regard loud agitators, but to disregard them; will not have to yield to a loud voice, but to listen for a still small voice; will have to seek for the opinion which is treasured in secret rather than for that which is noised abroad."

## THE LEGACY OF MR. GLADSTONE.

The career of Mr. Gladstone was, in a unique sense, the converse of that of his opponent. For, whereas Lord Beaconsfield was a man of the world, who served his Church, Mr. Gladstone was a Theologian who served the State. Devoted, from his earliest years, to the Church, powerfully influenced by the Oxford Movement, it was the lot of Mr. Gladstone, who, until the middle of his manhood, had always determined to become a Clergyman, to throw in his lot with the party which wanted to disendow the Church, and endeavour to transform it into an instrument for promoting morality both at home and abroad. For, it is to Mr. Gladstone that we owe the introduction of the Deity into Party politics, and that amazing attempt to promote International Peace, not through the medium of a powerful International Church, but through the medium of a political party, pledged to disendow the Church, a political party whose weapons for reducing Armaments, were talk and taxation.

At a time when slothful ease laps too many who ought to be public men, his boundless energy, and his deep devotion to all that he believed to be right, compel one to couch any references to the late Mr. Gladstone in terms of the fullest respect. If we, of this generation, are to climb out of the Bog of Materialism, into which we have fallen, it will be on the stepping-stones of our dead selves, and not by

vilifying the departed. While this is so, we are, to-day, in a position to understand clearly, the ditch into which Mr. Gladstone, in his ignorance of the world, both drove himself, and carried his followers to the third generation, when his yearnings after International Peace, led him into an attempt to transform a party of free-importing Merchants, organized for self-interest, into an instrument for promoting International Morality.

So immense, however, has been the influence of Mr. Gladstone in convincing a section of the Nation that the Liberal Party, which is pledged to disendow the Church, is peculiarly dear to the Deity—that I have been obliged—with some fear of giving pain—to pave the way to the re-establishment of a Church and State regime, by ridiculing attempts to transform the Liberal Party into a Catholic Corporation, to settle the question of a juster distribution of wealth by State Force, rather than Love, by taxation rather than voluntary gifts, and by appeals to the self-interest of the crowd rather than to the spiritual and moral aspirations of all citizens. For social reform by the crowd was tried in Athens, and resulted in the demoralisation of her public life, and in the loss of both her colonies and her fleet.

#### AUTHOR'S APOLOGY.

Those Liberals, therefore, who may have taken offence at my attempts to disabuse the public mind of the notion that our social ills are to be cured by

“the State” rather than the Church will, perhaps, do me the kindness of remembering that it was Mr. Gladstone who first raised the Athenian cry of “the Masses against the Classes”—which first led Liberalism on the wrong road—and that, in asking the Public to regard the present situation with a humour which is kindly and not malicious, I have not intended in any way to steep my pen in gall; but merely to enable those who want to see our social problems settled, to recognise fully the complete inability of “the State” to settle them; and the need of good-humoured tolerance among all parties, in the hope that persons more qualified for the task than myself, may preach from many an ancient pulpit, the grave need for genuine self-sacrifice among all classes; and for a resolute but cool headed determination, by God’s help, to house the Nation justly and moralize trade.

PRESENT JUNCTURE THE CONVERSE OF THAT AT OUR LAST  
RELIGIOUS REFORMATION, IN THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY.

Now, I do not think that we should be over-hard on either Mr. Gladstone, or those on whom his mantle has descended. It was inevitable that, at the end of a great epoch, confusion should arise; and that persons unacquainted with history should fall into the error of asking the State to remedy, by Force, social ills which are due to the temporarily needful disappearance of the endowments and discipline of the Church.



For we are now in a position to understand that the great Liberal Epoch, 1550 to 1900, is at an end. The duty of Liberalism was to rid us of the tyranny of Priests and of the Crown. To achieve this, Liberalism plundered corporate Church property, sequestrated Crown property, and determined that both the State and the Church should be popularly controlled by representatives of the people.

To day, the Church and the Crown are, for all practical purposes, controlled by the people. The trouble is that, in our Liberal desire for liberty, both the Church and the Crown have become too weak, and require to be rehabilitated. For, to-day, we are in a position to understand that, in the first place the influence of the Crown ought to return. Mr. Haldane—himself a Liberal—has said as much,\* and, as a matter of fact, the Crown has not, for over a hundred years, delivered so many social and patriotic appeals to the Nation as under a recent Liberal Government. The weakness of the present situation is, that Mr. Haldane and his friends have not also gripped how fully an epoch is over, and that it is high time now for the Church also to return and for us to establish a wealthy Neo-Catholic Corporation, to achieve by Church Love what cannot be achieved by State Force.

---

\* In a speech at the opening of University College, Hampstead.



DETAILED BUSINESS MORALITY CANNOT BE EFFECTED BY STATE FORCE, EXCEPT BY ARMING THE CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER WITH THE ARBITRARY INQUISITORIAL POWER OF A SIXTEENTH CENTURY POPE.

In jesting guise I must now point out, once more, that, unless we accept a twofold State and Church régime, and equip the Church efficiently for her new work, the results of the State attempting to promote morality by State-Force will become absolutely ridiculous. As the reader will readily perceive, we are on the eve of a Twentieth Century Reformation, and our position is exactly the converse of that of our ancestors at our Reformation in the Sixteenth Century. For, at the close of the mediæval period, the Church was too powerful. It had been too successful, and had paid the penalty of all successful Institutions, by losing its humility. Wealthy beyond the dreams of avarice, it had become over-centralized in the most superstitious quarter of Europe, and had, in utter contradiction to the original policy of its Founder, encroached upon and assumed to itself, the functions of the State. In consequence, it was despised by the intelligent, and controlled by the most fanatical and unenlightened beings in Europe; the climax being reached when a Pope used the war-ships of Spain to promote theological unity, and sent us the Spanish Armada as his "episcopal address."

*Our* position to-day is exactly the converse. At

the end of *our* Epoch, the State is encroaching rapidly upon the Church ; and one might almost go so far as to say that some of our politicians are the most unenlightened fanatics in the world.

In other words, all those moral ends which the State is to-day trying to achieve, can only be achieved by a Neo-Catholic Church. Here we have the State—whose first duty is to attend to National defence, delivering sermons on the moral evils of wealth, trying to promote temperance ; to prevent small boys from smoking cigarettes ; and employers from over-working their men. None of these things should really be undertaken by the State. The State ought to stand for physical and industrial efficiency—"arms and the man—the tools of him that can use them." The State ought to welcome the capable man, who is a bit of a tyrant, and goads his less energetic fellows to work. But to prevent such things as sweating, drinking, gambling, etc., what we want is not a State but a Neo-Catholic Corporation as powerful as the State, which can make its moral power felt throughout the business world—curbing, by gentle devices, the energy of the "get-on or get-out" business man, and by appeals to intelligence and aspiration, persuading people that life has nobler sport than incessant betting and drinking ; a Corporation which owns houses, and humanizes the casual labourer : which explains to a ten-year-old child the evils of smoking "fags," and

possibly spans him, instead of leaving the task to the Policeman and the retired Soldier: a Corporation which possibly even has a direct interest, as Shareholder, in shipping, railroads, and the corn market, and can prevent monopolies from being abused.

The State, may I submit, is too crude a weapon for promoting *detailed* business morality; and such attempts as the State has made to fulfil, by force, the functions of an up to-date Catholicism, have been so crude as to suggest a genial comparison between Mr. Lloyd George, or Mr. Churchill, and the more whimsical of the latter Popes, who supported the Spanish Inquisition. For what a burlesque situation they are bringing about!

The question, says Mr. Winston Churchill, which the State is now going to ask—for purposes of taxation—is not “How much money you have, but, how did you get it?” Now, this is a question, I maintain, which ought to be asked by the Church, and asked again and again. For it cannot be asked too often. Asked by a “State” which relies for its driving-force upon appeals to the “Man in the Street,” you may foment, or “work up” a cry against every business pursuit on the face of the globe. And the odd thing is, that Mr. Lloyd George and Mr. Churchill, and their friends, have not done it, but have acted on such Jesuitical lines—

"If," say these modern State Popes, "you have invested your money in land, or in brewing, you are wicked men, and we impose a moral fine upon you. We expect you to pay "Peter's Pence" to the Treasury, for your sins. If, however, you are a Turf Accountant, and make money out of gambling, we offer you an indulgence, because Cardinal Birrel, late chief of our Papal placarding department tells us that we can't "work up" a cry against you. Similarly, if you are a wealthy speculator, or grocer, or linen draper, who utilizes Social Machinery to pile up a fortune, or a popular Author, or a Dramatist, utilizing Social Machinery, and the vast size of our towns to make "fortunes" you all get indulgences. Similarly, if you are a Banker, and lend the money to your fellow-citizens to bolster up concerns which under-pay their employees, you get an indulgence. You may export capital abroad : you may squander thousands annually in vice—we give you indulgences. *But, if we catch you brewing beer or buying land, we go for you, and "Peter's Pence" you must pay.* We don't give you any reasons for this curious conduct, but we are quite certain our Papal placarding department can "work up" a street agitation against you ; and if you don't agree we send our Spanish Armada against you, in the shape of the fifteen millions reported to be on the verge of starvation. For, as Lord Carrington said in a recent speech at Shrewsbury :—

" Shall the Budget die  
Fifteen million Englishmen shall know  
the reason why."



## THE ARMADA UP-TO-DATE.

Now why should this Armada of fifteen million Englishmen be flung merely at the heads of those who have invested their money in Land and Brewing? Why not send this up-to-date Armada against the Turf Accountants, the Stock-brokers, the Pawn-brokers, the Theatres, the big London Emporia which undersell small tradesmen in the provinces—or wealthy grocers? On what grounds, after calling the Duke of Westminster a blackmailer, did “Pope” Lloyd George—as recorded in the press—recuperate himself for his attack on ‘Bung,’ by going for a sail in the ‘galleon’ of Sir Thomas Lipton? I must apologize for dragging in Sir Thomas Lipton’s yacht, but I am sure he will be amongst the first to admit that, if the rich Brewer has to pay “Peter’s Pence” so too should the rich Grocer. Similarly, why not hurl your Armada of the fifteen millions, etc., at the head of the Music Halls? Why should not those who make fortunes by hiring Ballet Girls pay special “Peter’s Pence,” as well as those who employ Barmaids? So too, why not hurl your Armada at all Music Hall “Stars,” and exact “Peter’s Pence” from Harry Lauder whenever he sings, “Stop your tickling Jock?” The large salary which he, and all theatrical celebrities, enjoy to-day—far in advance of what their predecessors received a hundred years ago—is not due to the fact that they are cleverer than David Garrick, or Mrs. Siddons. It is due to the vast growth of the population, as was pointed out by an



eminent dramatic critic, during the recent enquiry in regard to the dramatic censorship. It follows that, if you are going to "go for" those who have invested money in land or in brewing, you must also "go for" Music Hall "Stars."

Now, supposing that you took off ten per cent. from Harry Lauder's income, and he refused to laugh and insisted on crying, with the result that his salary went down to thirty shillings a week! The Treasury would be "done out" of their haul; and Lord Carrington would be able to end up an eloquent peroration upon the theatrical world at large, with the words :—

" Shall Harry Lauder cry  
Fifteen million Englishmen shall know  
the reason why."

IT WAS THE UNLUCKY DUTY OF THE LIBERAL GOVERNMENT WHO CAME INTO POWER IN 1906, TO ACHIEVE BY POLICY THAT SOCIAL REFORM WHICH WOULD OTHERWISE BE ACHIEVED BY SOMETHING IN THE NATURE OF A SOCIAL REVOLUTION. HAVE THEY DONE THIS?

Now, the rest of Lord Carrington's speech, in favour of the Budget, consisted of a most sportsman-like appeal to the honour and intelligence of the wealthy. It was utterly unlike the declamations of the President of the Board of Trade, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer. It is, therefore, without wishing to ridicule him, that I wish to laugh out of court attempts to solve social ills through the Lower House. It should, indeed, be clearly

understood that, in giving the following *resumé* of the course pursued by a recent Liberal Cabinet, whom we may designate "the Last of the Round-heads," I make no insinuations, especially against the older Members of the Cabinet; and especially against such an one as he who was lately known as John Morley, whose grey years and solid service to so many causes, deserve veneration and respect from those of us who are still young. I merely wish, on behalf of Neo-Catholic Cavaliers, to run a good-humoured rapier through that loud-voiced conception of statecraft which insists that the House of Commons is the best National Institution for Social Reform; and which urges that social reconstruction can be undertaken through a Liberal Party which has, since the Reformation, been a destructive Party; and which still uses destructive and spiteful, rather than constructive and gentle weapons. My object in doing this is not to defend what has of late been an anti-Catholic and plutocratic conception of the functions of Toryism, but to shew that what we want, and what we must have, is a modernized return to that good old State and Church regime, in accordance with which the State stands for stability and the Church for progress. And as I stand, for the present, quite alone in advocating it, I ask all parties to give me a fair hearing, as I attempt genially to demolish that Libero-Papistical Association which tries to do by Force what can only be done by Affection.

## A REPLY TO MR. ASQUITH.

To this end I will not meet Mr. Asquith with Neo-Tory weapons. I will not twit and taunt him with his want of faith in voluntary benevolence. I will not say that Free Imports offer him no chance of creating variety of employment. I will not urge that he has no policy for moralizing Trade, Finance and Legacies, or for making the Home the basis of Social Reform. I will meet him on ground of his own choosing: on the topic as to how far the House of Commons has the right to control Finance, and on the co-ordinate topic of Parliamentary precedents.

Now, Mr. Asquith, in his great speech at Birmingham, tells us as follows:—

“I assert,” he says, “with confidence that there is no rule more deeply ingrained in our Constitution, more solemnly hallowed by precedent, more plainly sanctioned alike by the traditions of the past and by the requirements of to-day, than that, in matters of finance, the Commons—the representatives of the people—have an absolute and unquestionable and decisive voice.”<sup>(a)</sup>

Now, for the moment, I let that stand. I shall shortly answer it fully. What I want first to remind the humblest working man, of a responsible kind, who dislikes crises, is what ill-starred precedents

---

(a) Speech at Bingley Hall, Birmingham, Sept. 17th, 1909.

Mr. Asquith and his friends have themselves set posterity : and to do this I will give a brief *résumé* of their career.

In 1906, these unlucky gentlemen came into power to fight against the stars in their courses by attempting to remedy our social ills, not through a constructive Neo-Catholic Corporation but through a destructive Institution—the House of Commons. What was the situation before them when they took office ? According to their own accounts, there were, so they asserted, fifteen millions—or one-third of the population—on the verge of starvation,\* and millions inadequately housed. At the same time, in the year 1906, there appeared in the House of Commons the first batch of Labour Members, forty in number. Here then, we observe his Majesty's Ministers face to face with a critical situation. They perceive that those who labour with their hands have begun to realize their strength ; and are determined to better their position. They perceive that the country is discontented : unemployment is prominent, sweating is rife, but, above all things, the homes

---

\* Liberals inform us that the fact of one-third of the population being on the verge of starvation is due to Tory extravagance. I submit that, if one-third of the population is, which I query, in this predicament, it is due to the fact that one-third of the land is not the property of that Old Tory Institution, the National Church. While as regards Armaments, I submit, in no party spirit, that the only Institution which will reduce Armaments, is also that old Tory Institution, an International Church.



of a vast section of the Nation are not what homes should be.

Now, under such circumstances, what is the obvious duty of a Statesman? The duty of a Statesman, when the country is seething with discontent, is not to increase that discontent and hasten the arrival of a Social Revolution. His duty is to achieve calmly by *policy* and *foresight* what may otherwise—as the presence of Labour Members in 1906 denoted—be achieved by something in the nature of a Social Revolution.

In other words, they were face to face with the situation, described by Walter Bagehot, in his essay on Mr. Gladstone, written in 1860, when he said:—

“We have now reached the term of the destructive period. . . The questions which remain are questions of construction—*how the lower classes are to be admitted to a share of political power without absorbing the whole power*; how the natural union of Church and State is to be adapted to an age of divided religious opinion, and to the necessary conditions of a parliamentary government. These, and such as these, are the future topics of our home policy. And on these the voice of the Nation will never be very distinct. Destruction is easy, construction is very difficult. A statesman who will hereafter learn what our real public opinion is, will not have to regard loud agitators, but to disregard them; will not have to yield to a loud voice, but to listen for a still small



voice; will have to seek for the opinion which is treasured in secret rather than for that which is noised abroad."

It follows that the question which, in all good humour, one must now put is, how far Mr. Asquith and his friends, have followed the advice of their old Liberal ally, Walter Bagehot, and listened to a loud voice, how far to a still small voice. It is a desperately ungracious question to ask. But, in the interest of Britain, the Dominions, and India, it is vital that the principle of the survival of the fittest forms of state-craft should hold good, and, to this end, it is my thankless duty to discountenance, if I can, that loud-voiced conception of state-craft, which asserts that the House of Commons is the place for Social Reform. How far, then, have Liberals been able, during the four years they have been in power, to effect Social Reform through the House of Commons? Let us quietly examine.

Well! In the first place, shortly after coming into power, the Cabinet passed an Employers' Liability Act: a trifle inquisitorial in character, but in the main, one to which no one can fairly take objection. They then spent a really immense time in debating over a theological Education Bill: and the fanaticism of some of their proposals so riled a large section of the Nation, that they began to lose popularity. This fanatical Education Bill was rejected by the Lords. They next approached the

Drink Problem. This they dealt with—not by the constructive device of asking for voluntary subscriptions from the several hundred wealthy Temperance Associations in the country, and entrusting an already existing *Public House Trust* with compulsory powers for purchasing slum public-houses, and placing them in the hands of those who would not push the drink, but would receive commissions on temperance drinks which they sold.

*On the contrary, they set to Labour Members the sacred and solemn precedent of proposing to destroy thirty thousand public-houses.*

Had this Bill been passed, I question whether it would have resulted in any diminution whatever, of drinking, for two reasons. In the first place, it would have led, of an evening, to crowding in those public-houses which remained. There would have been more chance, when a man went to a "pub." that he would meet a friend, and they would have a series of drinks together. From this point of view, the more public-houses there are, the more likely a man is to find no one he knows in the bar, drink a single glass and go home. I will concede to his Majesty's Ministers, that, on this point, I speak from personal experience! In the second place, had this attack on the Brewers succeeded, the Brewers, while not, perhaps, in as bankrupt a plight as some of them urged, would, without a doubt, have had to make some *quite abnormal effort to push the drink*

*for all they were worth, in the public-houses which remained.*

MR. ASQUITH'S FIRST PRECEDENT TO THE LABOUR PARTY.

The point, however, which I wish to emphasise is, that his Majesty's Ministers, in their endeavour to make for social re-construction, set the Labour Party the sacred and solemn precedent of proposing to destroy thirty thousand public-houses. I am not prepared to submit that there was nothing to be said for this step. What I do suggest is, that it was hardly the most common-sense—social—scientific and stable method of dealing with a great National Evil; which will, I am confident, *never* be cured until the bulk of our slum public-houses are placed in the hands of a Public House Trust, or Neo-Catholic Corporation which gives the man behind the bar a commission on temperance drinks.

MR. ASQUITH'S SECOND PRECEDENT TO THE LABOUR PARTY.

The House of Lords threw out the Licensing Bill, and his Majesty's Ministers were, to use a phrase of Mr. McKenna's, "filled with rage." And now the Junior Members of the Cabinet perceived that their destructive Liberal Party was losing ground. What was to be done? Far from opposing the action of the House of Lords in throwing out a destructive "Licensing Bill," the ordinary Britisher seemed inclined to "back" the Lords; and these Members of

the Cabinet perceived that it was getting out of touch with the general feeling of a Nation which abhors fanaticism. Their Act against street-betting was also unpopular with the more thriftless and ignorant and shallow and idle. With the facility of the artistic temperament, certain Members of the Cabinet were able, in imagination, to put themselves in the position of these latter. They therefore came to the rescue of the more frugal Members of the Cabinet, and pointed out that, despite their ability to "gas" at street-corners, the Liberal Balloon was not rising with that rapidity which was to be desired. And so, finding that bye-elections were being lost, and that they themselves were unable to rise in their balloon, his Majesty's Ministers determined to capture votes by throwing out ballast in the shape of £9,000,000 per annum non-contributory Old-Age Pensions.

It is surely needless to point out that the task of giving away five-shillings a week is a task which can be achieved by any "Jack-in-office." It follows that while such measures may buy votes from the ignorant and shallow, they will scarcely buy the good opinion of those who note the "sacred and solemn precedent" which Mr. Asquith set to what may be, ere long, the first Labour Ministry: viz.—"When you are losing bye-elections, offer a quasi-"bribe"\* to the Electorate."

---

\* *Mr. Churchill will perhaps concede that this term is initio logically exact.*



## MR. ASQUITH'S THIRD PRECEDENT TO THE LABOUR PARTY.

And now for the next "sacred and solemn precedent" set by Mr. Asquith and his friends. For, having promised these pensions, his Majesty's Ministers now found themselves in a most delicate situation. Do what they might, the Ladies in the country distrusted them. Go where they might, the instinct of the feminine world—half of the population—whose interests are most closely associated with Social Reform, was against them; and the Police precautions which had to be taken when the Czar of Russia recently visited the more savage regions of Poland, were exhibited in microcosm as precautions against the ladies when Liberal Members were to deliver addresses in happy Hampstead. And so, with a flourish of trumpets, his Majesty's Ministers decided to set the Labour Party the "sacred and solemn precedent" of concealing their social ignorance by sending up to the House of Lords a Bill for raising money from forms of unearned increment which is derived from land, and beer, and rousing the Nation against the Peers.

## MR. ASQUITH'S DEFENCE.

Now, in favour of this proceeding, Mr. Asquith quoted from the speeches of many eminent persons. He went back to Adam Smith, the father of Political Economy; and he quoted from many eminent statesmen, who had favoured the method of raising



revenue by land-taxes. He also declared that, if the House of Lords threw out this Money Bill, they would be acting contrary to precedents which were set in 1672 and 1678 with the legal support of Coke and Selden : in 1765 by William Pitt : in 1846 by the Duke of Wellington : in 1894 by Sir William Harcourt : and in 1907 by Mr. Balfour. All these eminent men, Mr. Asquith told us, maintained the principle that, to quote his precise words, "*in matters of finance the Lords are impotent, and the Commons are supreme.*" (Speech at Bingley Hall, Sept. 17, 1909.)

#### CIRCUMSTANCES ALTER CASES.

Now, as regards Mr. Asquith's Defence, I would beg the responsible reader to note that *all Mr. Asquith's precedents, save two, were taken from days when the Franchise had not been extended to the working classes, and that all Mr. Asquith's precedents, save one, applied to a time when there were no Labour Members in Parliament.*

That much, I think, Mr. Asquith will readily concede. *But, in conceding that, Mr. Asquith is conceding everything!* For precedents set when the Franchise was in the possession of the few can hardly be said to apply when the Franchise is extended to the many. In the time, moreover, of Coke, Selden, Chatham, and Adam Smith, the vote was possessed by a small select body of voters who were, in the main, engaged in *agriculture*. The policy of the Nation was not, in those days, con-

trolled at dense mass meetings in big cities. To take precedents from agricultural times—a century or two centuries ago—and apply them to urban conditions, may be perfectly just. But the question which responsible citizens will ask themselves is not, whether Mr. Asquith's knowledge of what our agricultural ancestors did in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries is correct, but whether, in dealing with the town social problems of the Twentieth Century, Mr. Asquith adopts methods which are up-to-date, scientific, benevolent, calculated to heal the breach between rich and poor, or whether, in attempting to destroy thirty thousand public-houses, in giving away £9,000,000 annually on non-scientific lines, and then allowing his junior colleagues to foster a quarrel with the Upper House, Mr. Asquith himself is not setting a somewhat dangerous example to the Labour Party, and supplying three somewhat decadent precedents to posterity.

JUDICIAL COMMONSENSE SHOULD BE DISPLAYED BY  
THOSE WHO APPEAL TO PAST PRECEDENTS.

But more than this. If you go back, as Mr. Asquith did, into the grim and gory annals of the seventeenth century, you can find precedents for anything. You will find precedents for bribing the Electorate, and checking free speech: precedents of which Mr. Asquith and his friends have, to a large degree, availed themselves. You will also find precedents (of which, happily, Mr. Asquith has not availed

himself) of bribing Members of Parliament. Mr. Asquith might find precedents to justify Mr. Haldane for marching into the House of Commons, at the head of the Territorials, deporting his Majesty's Opposition, and describing the process as "*Haldane's Purge*." Mr. Asquith might even find "sacred and solemn" precedents for beheading Mr. Balfour.

Far be it from me to say that there was not something to be said for proposing to destroy thirty thousand public-houses. Far be it from me to urge that there is not something to be said for telling a big audience "Shall the Budget die, fifteen million Englishmen shall know the reason why." All that I respectfully ask is, whether these destructive methods of doing good are the best methods! All I ask — with the frankest good-humour — is whether there are not simpler, more scientific, and more social methods of reform which can be undertaken, without any of these appeals to class hatred at excited mass meetings! I do not claim that fear of the Electoral power of the degraded should not play a modest part in the armoury of a Social Reformer, as one among many gentler weapons. All I urge is, that when we *have* a custom of voluntary benevolence, amounting to many, many, many millions a year, it is worth our while to ask ourselves whether that system ought not to be developed; to be made scientific, to be made socially fertile, through the medium of a new National Institution altogether: and whether a system of

relying for social service, upon Taxation and the Lower House is not well-nigh played out.

In a word, the question is not, from this point of view, what precedents were set in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. It is rather, what precedents are we, in the most scientific century in history, going to set to posterity? And what I respectfully ask of both Mr. Asquith and my thinking fellow-countrymen is whether, for purposes of social reform, both parties cannot unite, and agree to hand down to posterity a Neo-Catholic Institution, which relies for its driving-force on Altruism, and Love, whose methods are calculated to heal rather than widen the gulf between rich and poor, and to embody all that is kindest, most considerate, most benevolent, and most scientific, in this most enlightened of centuries. And that is a question which may surely be asked with the fullest recognition of Mr. Asquith's desperate ill-luck.

At the same time, I do wish gently to impress upon the more conceited and arrogant of the champions of destructive methods for healing social wounds, that responsible working men, and their wives, who have considered the Neo-Catholic proposals I have submitted, may possibly perceive that these destructive and arbitrary measures for dealing with merely two forms of unearned increment, are fanatical, antiquated, and Libero-Papist ways of doing good, which are not scientific, human, and benevolent enough for this scientific and up-to-date age.



## SUMMARY OF THE CASE AGAINST MR. ASQUITH.

When, therefore, Mr. Asquith says that there are "sacred and solemn" precedents whereby, in financial matters, the *House of Lords are impotent, and the House of Commons are supreme*, I must genially remind him that, if we accept his verdict, there is nothing to prevent a Labour Ministry coming into power, and sending up a Finance Bill to the House of Lords repudiating the National Debt, and quoting Mr. Asquith's precedent. A scheme for repudiating the National Debt, and Municipal Liabilities, spread over a period of fifty years, might be made to appear quite as specious as a scheme for destroying thirty thousand public-houses. In ancient Rome, where they relied on nothing but "the State" for Social Reform, Bills for repudiating debts were frequently passed through the Senate. The truth surely is, that the need of our age is to recognise not that the House of Commons is supreme in financial matters, and that the House of Lords is impotent. It is that, in social matters, the Church and voluntary benevolence (as the facts and figures I have given show) can easily be made supreme, and fulfil, as Mr. Asquith's destructive ideals cannot, our national prayer for the High Court of Parliament, viz. "that all things may be so ordered by their endeavours upon the *best* and surest foundations, that *peace* and *happiness*, *truth* and *justice* may be established among us *for all generations*."

My object in quoting this ancient prayer is not to



ridicule Mr. Asquith. My object in sweeping aside the argument that the House of Commons is the best Institution for social reform, is merely to divert the Nation's attention away from the barren bitter devices of the House of Commons, to kindly Neo-Catholic ones : to wash Class Hatred off the slate and write Love instead. For, though, during three centuries, the Nation has looked to the House of Commons for leadership, the day has at last dawned when we can look to the new activities of an ancient Church, whose ability to make the Home the *best* and *surest foundation* of reform, will be recognised by no one more gladly than by Mr. Asquith himself.

WINSTON SPENCER CHURCHILL THE NEBUCHADNEZZAR  
OF DEMOCRACY.

Now, while we are told that Mr. Asquith and Mr. Lloyd George are very "progressive" persons, imbued with the spirit of the age, there can be no doubt whatever, that if you went to one of the big London Emporia, where you can get anything you want, and asked for the *very latest thing* in Leaders, a smiling shop-walker would reply : "I will do him the credit of saying that he is not for sale ; but if you want the very pink of democratic perfection, the *crème de la crème*, in that particular line of goods, I most strongly advise you to ring up the President of the Board of Trade."

As a matter of fact, however, there is nothing

particularly new about Mr. Winston Churchill's sublime reliance upon his ability to adapt himself to the changing ideals of the "Man in the Street"; to be a Jingo to-day, and a little Englander to-morrow. His conception of state-craft was admirably mirrored in ancient Persia and Babylon, thousands of years ago, by hasty Despots. The only difference is, that Mr. Churchill represents the despotism of "the Man in the Street," whereas Nebuchadnezzar and Darius represented themselves. Fully recognizing his genius, I will, therefore, relieve the monotony of these pages by pointing out the kind of situation at which we shall arrive, if the three sacred and solemn precedents set by Mr. Asquith should be developed, when Mr. Churchill is Radical Premier and Mr. Victor Grayson his Chancellor of the Exchequer. For Mr. Churchill understands the moods of the Crowd exactly; and at the end of Mr. Balfour's administration, is quite capable of working up an agitation to value unearned increment of all kinds, by State-Force; and make himself virtually a demagogue Dictator in the Lower House, the "Robespierre" of the United Kingdom. The reader will recognise that I have taken a parallel of what may virtually happen, under a modernized form, from the account of the arbitrary despotic acts of Darius and Nebuchadnezzar. This is how the narrative would run:—

"And it came to pass that, in the year 1915, it pleased the Right Honourable Winston Spencer

Churchill to set over the Kingdom one hundred and fifty Valuers ; and over the Valuers three Presidents, of whom Winston was one, that the wealthy might give account unto the 'Man in the Street,' of all unearned increment, that the 'Man in the Street' should suffer no damage. And this Winston was preferred by the 'Man in the Street' over the Presidents, the Princes and the Lords, and thought to set himself over the whole realm.

"And it came to pass that, when no man knew this year what new form of taxation might be imposed next;\* when the credit of the country was broken ; and the poor starved in the streets ; the poor gathered themselves together and made a petition unto the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, and the Chairman of the Free Church Federation, and enquired whether, in the ancient annals of the realm, there was no account of one, a Social Reformer, named Christ, whose motto was Love ; and whose Church had, for fifteen centuries, acquired wealth by appeals to voluntary benevolence : a Church which healed the wounds between rich and poor, and regarded wealth as moral manure, and not as a political sweetmeat ?

---

\* " True civil liberty depends on the safety of property. There is none in a country where the rate of taxation is changed every year. A man who has 3,000 francs income does not know how much he will have to live on next year."—

“And it came to pass, that when the Satraps, the Councillors, the State Valuers, the Lawyers, and certain of the Scribes heard thereof, they went of one accord to the Right Honourable Winston Spencer Churchill, and cried, saying :—

“ ‘Winston Churchill live for ever!’ Hast thou not signed a decree that any man that shall ask a petition save of thee, or of the ‘Man in the Street,’ for thirty years, shall be called a *miserable minority who represent nobody but themselves* ?

“And it came to pass, that when he heard this, the Right Honourable Winston Spencer Churchill was filled with fury ; and gave orders to set up a Statue to State-Force, whose height was three-score cubits, and the breadth thereof six cubits. And he set it up on the plain of Salisbury, in the Province of Canterbury ; and gave command, saying :—

“O peoples, nations, and languages, to you it is commanded, that at whatsoever time ye shall hear the sound of the cornet, flute, harp, sackbut, dulcimer, and all kinds of music, ye shall fall down and worship the image of State-Force that I have set up.

“Then drew near the Satraps, the Treasurers, the Councillors, the Lawyers, and the State Valuers, and cried saying :—

“Winston Churchill live for ever! There are certain three that, after disendowing the Church in Wales, thou hast permitted to hold diminished

Christian endowments : to wit, the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, and the Chairman of the Free Church Federation. But these men, O Winston, have not regarded thee ; they serve not thy god, nor worship the ideal of social reform by State Force which thou hast set up.

“And it came to pass, that the Right Honourable Winston Spencer Churchill answered, saying :—‘Is not my name Churchill, and ill shall it fare with a Church that stands between me and my ambition to make the party of Free Importers the Moral Regenerator of the Age?’” And he commanded, and they straight-way destroyed all remaining Church endowments, and cast the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, and the Chairman of the Free Church Federation into the furnace of affliction. And it came to pass that, after this, the Right Honourable Winston Spencer Churchill destroyed 30,000 public-houses, and 60,000 private drinking clubs were established in their stead.

“Now the rest of the acts of the Last of the Roundheads, and all that he said, are they not written in the Book of *Numbers*, wherein he put his trust.”

#### PEN-PICTURE OF A NEO-CATHOLIC CIVILIZATION.

Let me not be misunderstood. I bear no personal ill-will against Mr. Churchill, and in selecting him for especial consideration, meant to go for the boldest of the Buccaneers. All I wish to do is to laugh



out of court, the ideal of promoting Social Reform through the Lower House, which Mr. Churchill has *hitherto* accepted as being wisest.

In so doing, I am not, for an instant, defending a plutocratic conception of Society : nor am I, in my heart of hearts, as opposed to what Mr. Churchill and his friends have said, as might appear from a hasty perusal of these pages. I rather believe that, what they have said will, some day, be recognized as having been necessary. For it is right that those now living under degraded conditions, should feel that they have people who can boldly voice their bitterness and their discontent.

Dicontented people are not, however, the best types of character to be entrusted with the government of Great Britain, and India ; and when Mr. Asquith and his young friends go the length of declaring that they are the representatives of the people, one must, in the interests of constitutional sanity, bring up such forces as one can muster, to show that *men who would really represent the People, must voice, not their discontent, nor yet the ability to capture a few thousand more votes than another party in the State. On the contrary, they must represent the wisdom which can uplift and inspire the People. And it is my earnest contention that such wisdom is to be found, as regards social matters, not at crowded electoral meetings, but in a totally new conception of the practical functions of the Church as the Landlord of the Casual Labourer.*

Until he has fully gripped this fact I must cordially differ from Mr. Churchill. Mr. Churchill has before him the picture of two parties in the Nation, the Poor and the Rich. The poor are many, the rich are few but powerful. Progress, according to Mr. Churchill, will proceed by leading the poor against the rich.

The view of the situation, which a prolonged study of history has taught me, is otherwise. I perceive that we are on the eve of a Neo-Catholic Civilization; which will, in certain salient respects, resemble the old Catholic Civilization of the Middle Ages, but on a higher scientific plane. A sketch, in a few words, by Mr. Froude—no friend to Rome—describes the old Catholic Civilization :—

“Down to the Reformation of the sixteenth century,” he wrote, in his sketch of Disraeli, “the beliefs and habits of the English nation were formed by the Catholic Church. Men and women of all ranks were brought up on the hypothesis that their business in this world was not to grow rich, but to do their duties in the state of life to which they had been called. Their time on earth was short. In the eternity which lay beyond, their condition would wholly depend on the way in which it had been spent. On this principle society was constructed, and the conduct, public and private, of the great body of the people was governed by the supposition that the principle was literally true.”

Now, as I understand him, the Neo-Catholic man will have an intense conviction as to the reality of spiritual phenomena. His faith in the immortality of the human spirit will be boundless. He will be indifferent to wealth for himself. And, though a hard-worker, all his energies will go towards creating the best environment he possibly can for the children. He will devote much of that imagination which we poor fools spend in scribbling, to architecture, and to beautifying the outside world. For he will recognise the need that all streets and houses should be a joy to the eye. The power which will create this man will be a Neo-Catholicism whose methods will be gentle, yet stern : a Neo-Catholicism which will expect much from all citizens, and will get it.

In fifty years' time, the Neo-Catholic man will look back at this Budget Epoch, and will say, "What ungenerous poltroons were many who opposed the Budget, and what tactless idiots were many who advocated it in the tone and manner they did." "Proposals for a juster distribution of wealth," they will say, "ought to have been accepted with better grace, by the wealthy, than they were. But they obviously ought not to have been put forward by people who represented the discontent of the poor, rather than the wisdom which could uplift them. The Nation ought to have had the intelligence to see the need for Neo-Catholicism long before." From this point of view one can perhaps

imagine that Mr. Churchill's little grandson, reading of Mr. Churchill's early career, will be heard, in fifty years' time, to sum up the situation, something as follows :—

“Grandfather *was* in a hurry was'nt he! He wanted to hustle our ancestors into generosity; to kick them into kindness. What splendid energy grandfather shewed. But he was just a trifle wanting in Neo-Catholic *savoir faire*.\* And was'nt Mr. Lloyd George a funny man! He wanted to pull out people's golden fangs with political pincers. He ought to have carried one of those ragged little slum girls into Westminster Abbey, or the City Temple, and have asked *all wealthy* persons—not merely those who brewed, or owned land—what they were going to give voluntarily, of their own free will, to build proper homes for her and her mother, and all little girls like her.

“As for the one who went for grandfather so hard, I don't think he was nice at all. *It was clever, but was it cricket?*—or was it that he secretly admired grandfather, and thought he would select him out of all the unpopular politicians and, in so doing, go for the stag? But grandfather got his own back in a way that everyone respected, so it ended happily after all. But as all politicians were becoming

---

\* The writer presumes that Mr. Churchill's grandson will, like Macaulay, possess from his earliest years, the distinguished verbal lucidity of his grand-sire.

unpopular, it was very easy to go for one of them ; and to come in on the top of a Neo-Catholic wave, and laugh at everyone, was'nt very nice. He was'nt a real Neo-Catholic, but just a sort of Half-Way House on the heath, where rich and poor were going to fight, only instead of fighting, they first listened to his silly jokes, and then, both rich and poor, linked hands all round, like good old 'sports,' and first sang "Auld Lang Syne," and then that Tory Cavalier ditty—a parody from Robert Browning—which he wrote for them :—

Marching along, steady and strong  
Tories and Liberals singing this song :

*" On gold and silver over-much  
Let cravens set their store,  
He may not fight for Queen and Right  
Who loves not honour more.*

*In sowing bitterness and strife  
Let bachelors find zest :  
He may not toil for Church and Wife,  
Who loves not Duty best."*



## CHAPTER XII.

## STATE AND CHURCH :

OR,

## STABILITY AND PROGRESS.

“There is a dayspring in the history of this Nation, which only those upon the mountain-tops can as yet recognise. You deem you are in darkness. I see a dawn.”—BEACONSFIELD.

Essential as has been, for many years, the need for returning to a “Church and State” regime, that need has never been so apparent, on the very surface, as at the present time. A point made, in this connection by Comte, happily sums up the central idea of the last chapter. Speaking of the old Church and State system at its best, he observes :—

“By the aid of Catholicism, morality escaped from the control of policy to assume the social supremacy which is its due.”

From this point of view, the vast number of persons in the country who wish for social and moral progress, but, to use a familiar expression, are “sick and tired of politics,” are all of them Neo-Catholics without knowing it. What such persons have to do,

in every town, is slowly to form themselves into a home-acquiring Corporation, quite apart from "the State" or the Municipality, to endow their Corporation with voluntary gifts of land, houses and shares; and, under such local and national leadership as shall be forth-coming, discipline their Corporation till it is in a position to make its power felt in every department of the National Life. They will have much to contend against. Nothing but intelligent disinterestedness and self-sacrifice will enable their Corporation to win the confidence of all classes, as the old Catholic Church did. But, having done so, it will, eventually, be able entirely to relieve both the State and the Municipality, of all responsibility, as regards the Housing Problem, and the Drink Problem, and the rest of our social ills, for the solution of which wealth will be forthcoming from voluntary sources, and discipline will be forthcoming of a more delicate and detailed character than can be enforced by the Police.

THE STATE MUST ATTEND EFFICIENTLY TO NATIONAL DEFENCE, INDUSTRY, AGRICULTURE, AND IMPERIAL FEDERATION.

It follows that the State will be left free to attend to National Defence, and to taking such steps as, without weakening individual initiative, shall make for both agricultural and industrial efficiency.

Of the detailed functions of the State, in regard to National Defence, Agriculture, and Industry, it is

impossible for me to do more, in the present chapter, than briefly develop a few of the suggestions already submitted, in reference to (*a*) National Training: (*b*) the eventual abolishment of Death Duties on agricultural land, and the substitution of an alternative whereby an incoming heir reduces rents, seven, ten, or fifteen per cent. (whatever the incidence of death duties may be) to those Farmers who agree to increase the wages of their labourers, and possibly, in certain instances, who agree to grow corn: (*c*) the establishment of moralized Protection, with an especial view to fostering new industries, and moralizing trade.

To what extent a bold reliance on honour and voluntary benevolence can alter the whole aspect of the homes of the Nation, and to what extent both the Banks and our Neo-Catholic Corporation will be able to quicken the development of agriculture, time alone will tell. The central idea which I wish to make in the present chapter is, that unless we show bold faith in benevolence and capitalize an efficient disciplinary Neo-Catholic Corporation to relieve the State of the responsibility of attending to the minutiae of social reform, the State will become anarchic in character, and the British Empire will go to pieces.

This is, assuredly, no exaggeration! For it is obvious, on the very face of it, that if the State, whose primary function is to maintain order and efficiency, is to be turned into an Institution for solving the

problem of a juster distribution of wealth, on jam-spreading political lines, there will be an end to all order, discipline, and self-sacrifice. Everyone who opposes schemes for placing money in the hands of party politicians, wherewith they shall offer the Electorate "bribes," or quasi-bribes, will be told that "fifteen million English men shall know the reason why."\* No disciplinary scheme will be proposed for ameliorating the condition of the poor, for fear of losing votes. And this state of things will be followed by the disappearance from political life of all the best types of character, who will not permit themselves to become the "Toadies" of the

---

\* The writer would again apologize to Lord Carrington and his Party. When he uses the word *bribery* in both this and the last chapter, he uses it in no offensive sense whatever. He submits that the Old Age Pensions Act *was* a species of bribery, of which both Parties were equally guilty. It was almost inevitable that, at the fag-end of an Epoch, such a crude Act should have been passed to relieve distress, which will in future have to be dealt with on disciplinary Neo-Catholic lines : and if he (the writer) had been a Member of Parliament, without a grip of the Neo-Catholic principle, he would probably have voted for it. If he has used expressions about the Measure, which have given pain, he would heartily beg forgiveness from all concerned. It is not the persons of our Politicians, but the principles which they unwittingly embody, which he abominates, in the light of Neo-Catholicism ; and if he has indulged in "personalities," the humour in which he has endeavoured to muffle them, will, he hopes, secure a cordial consideration for the Neo-Catholic Principle, even from those who may abominate his person !

"Man in the Street" on the one hand, or the subservient hirelings of the Plutocrat on the other.

But, above all, by attempting to become an altruistic assembly, the House of Commons and the State will cease to attend properly to National Defence, and to encourage, in business matters, the principle of leadership by the fittest.

At the opening of Chapter XI., we saw clearly that the Founder of Christianity was not merely the gentle altruist, but that his frequent references to military topics, his recognition of the order-maintaining Roman State, and his desertion of the effete East for the physically and morally hardier West, justify us in believing that he grasped clearly the scientific principle of leadership by the fitter Races. From this point of view, it is surely possible for the modern Christian to be an Altruist, and to believe in Love, as embodied in a practical Neo-Catholic Corporation, and, at the same time, to believe in a needful, though not an exaggerated, racial struggle.

THE STATE MUST MAKE FOR NEEDFUL SELF-ASSERTION  
THE CHURCH FOR SELF-REPRESSION.

If you accept the point of view that "the State" is never to be aggressive, is always to turn the other cheek, is always to allow itself to be exploited by other Nations, I do not see how human progress is to be secured. Nor is there any evidence in the life



of the Founder of Christianity, which makes it necessary for Christians to be nothing but Altruists, and to relinquish all struggle and competition. Reasonable struggle and competition, between both nations and individuals, appears to be vital to the interests of posterity and of the human race at large, by securing the predominance of the fittest types, which will be, none the less, altruistic types.

Previous to the appearance of the Founder of Christianity, may I repeat, once more, Altruism was not embodied in any Nation at all. Nations and men spent the best part of their time fighting to secure those slaves who, in days when there was no machinery, alone made leisure possible : and, as Mr. Kidd has pointed out so brilliantly in his *Principles of Western Civilization*, the Romans were the predominant race who imposed their laws (which were of a higher type than those of other peoples) on the rest of the ancient world. Inasmuch, therefore, as Altruism was not embodied efficiently in any Institution before his time, the Founder of Christianity was compelled to over-emphasise Altruism, and to say : "If any man shall ask for thy coat, give him thy cloak also : if any man smite thee on the left cheek, offer him the other also." All preachers of a totally new gospel thus exaggerate, in order efficiently to drive home new truths.

DANGER OF CONFOUNDING COWARDICE WITH  
ALTRUISM.

To-day, however, long peace has so permeated these isles, that there is a grave fear of Altruism degenerating, in sheltered Britain, into sheer physical and moral cowardice. It is an unpleasant thing to have to say, but it is none the less true. We are told, for instance, indeed the argument is quite freely used, that if we do not allow other Nations to dump their goods here, but erect Tariff Walls against them, they will not like us, and will increase their Armaments; and that, in the interests of Christian Peace, the British "State" ought, therefore, to allow them to exploit us, and keep us out of their markets: and that, for the same reason, we ought not to have universal National training.

In the light of the New Testament, I cannot, for the life of me, see that there is anything remotely Christian in such a cowardly view of our needs. It is surely the case of the strong man armed keeping his palace. What, therefore, I cannot but submit is, that what we want is for "the State" to represent the principle of military, naval, and industrial efficiency, or self-assertion, and the Church the principle of self-repression or manly humility. Both of these two elements, history teaches, are to be found in the truly Christ-like character. For the Founder of Christianity, as we saw in the last chapter, was not merely an altruist, but also bold and authoritative.

It is, I know, urged that, if there were no costly armaments in such nations as Britain and Germany, there would be more money for Social Reform, and that costly armaments exercise no useful functions. The point, however, surely is, that while armaments may seem expensive, they form a very small part of the total energies of these two great Nations. And the real truth is that, in both countries, we have to learn to be able to defend ourselves, and to quicken social advance at the same time. And if, as a Nation, we have not the grit and self-sacrifice to take off our present luxurious habits, roll up our sleeves, and render to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and to God the things that are God's, then Science and Christianity unite in telling us that we shall have to make way for fitter races who *can*.

HOW THEIR COSTLY ARMAMENTS HAVE BENEFITTED  
BOTH BRITAIN AND GERMANY.

Looking broadly at the situation, it seems impossible to deny that, in about a hundred and fifty years' time, the numerical pressure of America from the West, and of Russia from the East, may ultimately result in a close commercial federation between Germany, France, Britain, and Holland. Until, however, these four Nations are really heavily pressed from the outside, there is ample evidence to shew that their international rivalry and heavy armaments are beneficial to Humanity at large and the Nations individually. Take, for instance, the case of Germany. What is going on in Germany

to-day? Her desire to have a strong fleet, and to get to the sea, is resulting in heavy taxation being imposed on all German subjects. But, what is the result of this taxation? It is leading to a development of the German Constitution; just as, in the reign of Charles I. and William IV., heavy taxation in Britain resulted in constitutional development with us. It is, indeed, heavy taxation alone which goads Nations into learning the art of self-government. For most men are naturally lazy and require the stimulus of a quasi-tyranny to help them forward. The German people, therefore, under the pressure of taxation, are demanding a greater control over their central Executive; which is becoming more "popular." Armaments are compelling, driving, harassing, if you like, the Germans into what will, ultimately, prove a more enlightened and fitter form of Government than that Kingly Bureaucracy which has merely been educating German citizens for fuller responsibilities. But for their heavy armaments and Bismarck's policy of blood and iron they would have slumbered on, German National Unity would never have been achieved, and the further constitutional development we have recently witnessed would never have occurred.

Turning, on the other hand, to Britain, what do you behold? Is the development of Germany at sea beneficial or harmful to us? I maintain that it is doing us good, both physically and morally. We had been having too easy and slothful a time



of it for the last forty years. We were getting sloppy and sentimental. We were living on the reputation of our grandfathers and great grandfathers

“Forgetting the need to hold proudly,  
The fame that those fathers had won.”

And this development of Germany, if it puts us on our mettle, if it leads to a modest system of disciplinary National training ; if it leads to a closer federation of Britain with the Dominions, will be good for us. It will save us from becoming effete. It will widen our mental and moral horizon. Here we see Germany with a population of sixty to our forty millions, and America, with a similar population, entering markets where we once had the field to ourselves. We have no earthly cause to want to go to war against them : we have no earthly need to wax Jingoistic. What we do need to do is to look to our bulwarks, physical, strategic, and industrial. What we need is disciplined co-operation. And the best device for learning discipline, and getting the nonsense knocked out of us, is a military training in youth.

IT IS NOT THE DUTY OF THE FLEET TO DEFEND  
THESE ISLES, BUT OF EVERY BRITISH CITIZEN.

It is, I know, often urged that there is no need for National Training, because we have the Fleet. But there is not, I believe, a single soldier or sailor who has studied strategy, who will fail to support me when I assert that the duty of Cruisers is to defend



our corn route, and our vast over-sea commerce, and that it is the duty of our Battleships, in case of war, to go for the battleships of our opponents, *wherever they may be.*

If we continue to accept the cowardly theory that our battleships exist to secure us against a Continental Invader, there is nothing to prevent a Continental Power, with a Fleet, from giving our Fleet the slip, and *devoting the whole of their Naval Force to intercepting, in mid-Atlantic, the boats that bring our food and our industrial raw material.* And a Continental enemy, with the remotest grip of the strategic situation, by doing this, would cut our Fleet in half. *Only half our Fleet would be able to go after their's; the rest would have to stay and protect us us from a Foreign Invader. And with our Fleet divided, a Foreign Navy would be able to smash it up in detail.*

It follows that the only honourable course for us to take, which will guarantee peace, and secure us the respect of the world, is a system of universal National training; *which will leave our Fleet free to follow an enemy's Fleet, wherever that Fleet may go.* Any other policy is a cowardly policy, unworthy of the name we bear.

In submitting these facts to the earnest consideration of my countrymen, I advocate no jingoistic or materialistic conception of Society. I do not believe, for an instant, that the Civilization at which we should aim should be a Military Civilization. What

I submit is, that it should comprise all that has been best in the Civilizations of the past, that it should seek to blend the spiritual aspiration of Palestine, the beauty of Greece, the military discipline of Rome, the Altruism and self-sacrifice of the Middle Ages, and should (with the help of our recent Machine Age) give all classes such leisure as is necessary for the living of a complete and rounded life, spiritually—morally—intellectually—and physically.

If, in the above passage, I appear for the moment to have over - emphasized the need of National Military Training in youth, it is because, from an intimate knowledge of our day and generation, I believe that we are not as physically brave as we should be : and that a system of military discipline in youth is vital to the preservation of both our country and our health. The ideal of manhood at which we should aim, must be the ideal of a manhood physically strong, but possessing the strong man's pity for the weak. That pity should never degenerate into self-pity ; or shrinking away from conflict — industrial and strategic — self-assertion being as necessary as self-repression, or, as Milton so nobly has it :—

“I cannot praise a fugitive and cloistered virtue, unexercised and unbreathed, that never sallies out and seeks her adversary, but slinks out of the race, where that immortal garland is to be fought for, not without dust and heat.” (a)

---

(a) Milton's *Areopagitica*.

THE NEED FOR IMPERIAL FEDERATION BETWEEN  
BRITAIN AND THE DOMINIONS.

While, therefore, it is submitted to all thinking citizens, that to solve our social ills at home, and to make for a kindlier and more generous understanding between ourselves and other Nations, we need a Neo-Catholic Corporation, I cannot but cordially urge that, as regards the tasks which lie before "the State," the problem of the century is the federation of Britain and the Dominions, for purposes of both defence and industry, and the disciplining and hardening of all classes, to meet the inevitably increasing competition of the future.

As one who would fain see a development of that ideal for which Mr. Chamberlain has as good as given his life, I advocate no bragging or boastful Imperialism. With Nations like America, and Germany rapidly absorbing an increasing share of the commerce of the world, there is surely nothing bragging or boastful in a policy whereby these little isles, with a population of but 40,000,000 to 45,000,000, should accept the desires of the Dominions for closer strategic and industrial federation. On the contrary it is a case of either federating or getting knocked out of the ring of Civilization.

## THE 'TRUE IMPERIALISM A VILLAGE IMPERIALISM.

While, however, it is manifest that the process of Imperial federation, must proceed apace, it does not follow that a party pledged to federate Britain with

the Dominions should neglect social reform at home. There is a certain type of mind, to be found usually in London, which, with singular vacuity, talks blandly about "the Empire" and ridicules all consideration of local social reform as "parochial." Men of this type may have cut some figure in the Unionist Party of the Past, but in the Tory Party of the Future they will be regarded as merely lazy loungers. For the State and Church Party of the Future will believe, with Lord Beaconsfield and old Church-and-King Tories, that the parish is the bulwark of our liberties, and that, if they wish to stop a system under which they are to be inspected and dragooned by Parliamentary Officials, those modern Whigs, who are abnormally wealthy, will do well to attend, above all things, to providing decent homes for their poorer fellow-Britons, in their parishes.

I would go a step further, and suggest that, if such men decline to attend to the homes of the people, our Empire will be an Empire with a gold head, but feet of clay ; and will very soon come to an end. The back-bone of any practical scheme for federating Britain and the Dominions must be the Home, the family tie, and a religious education, which shall teach the sons of the Empire that, though they may put the ocean between themselves and their kinsfolk, the God of their fathers shall be their God ; and that it shall ever be theirs to find, wheresoever the Union Jack is unfurled, that though the Home they may make for wife and bairns shall be new,



that Home, and all it stands for, shall be hallowed and uplifted by the renewed disciplinary\* activities of an ancient Church.

The Imperialism, therefore, that is advocated in these pages is not an Imperialism which sneers at the hamlet or the cottage, at the parish Church, or even at the parish pump. For there are certain Jingoistic Fleet Street "Imperialists" who would be much better if their heads were cooled under the latter. The Imperialism that is advocated is one which recognises, as the greatest of all our Imperial assets, the old village vigour, and all that it shall yet live to stand for when the renewed activities of an ancient Church, in regard to both their homes and their education, shall have broken down those barriers described by the poet Gray, when he sang of the old villagers :—

" Beneath those rugged elms, that yew-tree's shade,  
Where heaves the turf in many a mouldering heap,  
Each in his narrow cell for ever laid,  
The rude forefathers of the hamlet sleep.

Let not ambition mock their useful toil,  
Their homely joys, and destiny obscure;  
Nor grandeur hear with a disdainful smile  
The short and simple annals of the poor.

---

\* Without defending the financial methods of the Salvation Army, it is worthy of notice that they have anticipated the Neo-Catholic movement by the disciplinary hold which they possess over certain of their colonists whom they have financed.



Nor you, ye proud, impute to these the fault  
If memory o'er their tomb no trophies raise,  
Where through the long-drawn aisle and fretted vault  
The pealing anthem swells the note of praise.

Some village-Hampden, that with dauntless breast  
The little tyrant of his fields withstood,  
Some mute inglorious Milton here may rest,  
Some Cromwell, guiltless of his country's blood.

But knowledge to their eyes her ample page  
Rich with the spoils of time, did ne'er unroll ;  
Chill penury repress'd their noble rage,  
And froze the genial current of the soul."

TOWARDS AN IMPERIAL FERRY ; OR, THE PROBLEM  
OF A TAX ON CORN.

" Ah ! " says a reader, " And now I suppose that, with your *Village Imperialism*, you are speciously leading us on to a scheme whereby, to secure concessions from Canada for our manufactures, you advocate a tax on foreign corn, which will give the Canadians a preference in the Home Market, and *vice-versa* ? "

Well ! I am not afraid to submit that it is an open question if a small tax on foreign corn would raise the price of bread at all. Looking, however, at the situation fair and square, I prefer to submit that there is another alternative to tariffs—or rather a supplement to tariffs—which is worth some consideration, and which I will briefly summarise.

When Bismarck established Protection in Germany, he recognised that a most important element

in the price of corn was not merely tariffs, but the cost of carriage. He established, therefore, a working arrangement with the German Railways, whereby, when the price of corn went up, the cost of carriage went down, and hence the price of bread was kept level.

Now, this fact not merely suggests, to an unprejudiced mind, whether a similar arrangement could not be arrived at between the State and the Railways at home, but also between the State and the ships which bring our corn-supply from Canada.

If, that is to say, we will only establish a Neo-Catholic Corporation to look after social questions and leave it to "the State" to attend to industrial and agricultural efficiency, the statesmen of the future might, in the course of—shall we say ten years?—arrive at a working arrangement with the Dominions, whereby Britain and the Dominions become heavy share-owners—but not, I submit, Managers—in an Imperial Ferry. Working on these lines, with the loss borne jointly by Britain and the Dominions, we might so cut down the cost of carrying corn to Britain, and re-shipping our industrial manufactures, as to offer our Canadian and Australian kinsfolk a preference in the Home Market, without any appreciable tax having to be put on foreign corn, etc., at all.<sup>(a)</sup>

---

(a) The question whether, to foster British Agriculture, a small tax should be placed on Continental food ought, I submit, to be considered in the scientific light of facts as they are, and

This is surely the simplest device for utilizing the industrial value of the Imperial tie. For if any other Nation endeavoured to imitate it and cut down the cost of carriage, it would have, *single-handed*, to bear a loss which would, under the system advocated, be shared by *both* Britain and the Dominions, to their mutual advantage, in the form of security of markets, and cheaper fares for both goods and passengers.

---

not of a *priori* theories that taxing is good. The facts, I submit, are that our abnormal devotion to exports for 70 years, has resulted in an abnormal congestion of population in the export towns of London, Glasgow, Liverpool, etc. These towns can be fed most cheaply by boats bringing food in bulk from abroad. Once having secured a footing in export towns, foreigners can afford to throw their surplus stock inland at cheap rates. By laying less stress on what Lord Beaconsfield called a "gambling foreign commerce," and more emphasis on producing goods for home consumption, it will be possible for many of our manufactures, now centred in export towns, to be shifted inland to cheaper sites, and, in some instances, garden cities. By these means, Protection for Manufactures will result, with a little leadership, in distributing the population over a bigger area, and decentralizing the big export towns. Our inland towns will then be fed more largely from inland sources. When this process has continued for some time, a substantial tax on foreign food might prove beneficial to all classes. Until our big export towns are decentralized, a juster distribution of population effected, and the casual labourer settled in a Church-owned home, it is a question whether anything but a very small tax on foreign food would be beneficial, without being unjust, to the small wage-owner. It is by reducing local agricultural railway rates, and encouraging co-operation between Farmers, that we shall, for the present, best assist the British Farmer. Merely taxing foreign agriculture is surely a slovenly device for surmounting the situation.

## IMPERIAL FEDERATION NOT A PARTY QUESTION.

In advocating Imperial Federation, and the establishment of an Imperial Ferry, I am not advocating, in any sense, a party policy, or a hasty policy. On the contrary, Liberals will remember that, at the recent Imperial Press Conference, it was one of their own number—Lord Crewe—who laid an even greater stress than I have done, on the need for better means of communication between different sections of the Empire.

That, with efficient finance at Westminster, the cost of a scheme for cheapening the transit of both goods and passengers could be met by the State, within reasonable time, there can be little doubt. Quite recently, we were informed by one of his Majesty's Ministers, that during the last seventy five years, over five-hundred million pounds sterling have been spent on Poor Law. And under the scheme submitted in these pages, the millions now spent on Poor Law will all, eventually, be available for State purposes.

Surely this is a more scientific way of regarding the problem of Imperial Federation, than merely relying on a tax on corn, to unite us and our kinsfolk beyond the seas. Anyone can put a two-shilling tax on corn, just as anyone can give away five-shillings a week in pensions, and both these devices are surely—with all due respect to their founders—



somewhat early-Victorian and crude. What, for instance, do South Africans want from the Imperial tie? Their supreme need is a reduction in the immense cost of carriage across the Atlantic of agricultural implements, galvanized iron, and manufactured articles of all kinds, which a people engaged in agriculture want, but can only purchase in large quantities if the cost of carriage from Europe is cheap. But how can this be achieved by a tax on corn?

To talk about Britannia being the Mistress of the Seas, and of our being a sea-Empire, and at the same time leave the sea in command of shipping combines which often take short views of our needs, and those of the Dominions, is not to possess the command of the sea at all, in any intelligible sense of the word. And with the fullest fairness to existing Steamship lines, both Liberals and Conservatives can surely agree that John Bull should be Master along his own sea roads, and that goods and passengers should be able to be shipped between Britain and the Dominions, on lines which offer a preference to all British goods. Nor is it unreasonable to submit that such a scheme may be slowly carried through by the State, if we will only give our statesmen that leisure to devote to the cause of Imperial Federation, and Industrial Efficiency, which they will only have when domestic social ills are attended to by a Neo-Catholic Corporation.



REVITALIZING BRITAIN AND HUMANIZING THE  
DOMINIONS.

In submitting this State proposal anent an Imperial Ferry, I am not—it must be remembered—urging that such a scheme can have been carried out by 1913, or even by 1915. I am merely endeavouring to submit the broad basis of the State and Church policy of the Party of the Future during the next forty or fifty years. I submit that we want to have a clear conception of the functions of the State as making for stability, for industrial and agricultural efficiency, and for strengthening the bonds between Britain and the Dominions, on lines which will help to re-vitalize and virilize an ancient Nation, and, from places like Oxford (where the Imperial Rhodes' Scholars of to-day come), give the Dominions, in return, something of that culture of which a large number of persons in this country have, perhaps, just a dash too much.

If, therefore, you reply that it would be a huge job to create a cheap Imperial Ferry for both goods and passengers, if you say that such a Ferry would be aided by "the State" in Britain and the Dominions, without any profit, I would submit to your earnest consideration that, if it comes to the question of pounds, shillings and pence, you cannot describe our National Schools as paying a dividend. But, to anyone who brings a knowledge of history to bear upon the present situation, it must be apparent, my countrymen, and let us concede it to the Liberals,

that the National Schools which they established in 1870, have saved us from what would otherwise have proved, a genuine, and not merely a "literary," Social Revolution. And just as the education in those schools, though often bookish in character and leaving much to be desired is worth, morally and socially, far more than the money we pay for it; so, too, a cheap system of transit between Britain and the Dominions, will, strategically, industrially, morally, and socially, be well worth the cost of running it.

In advocating Imperial Federation on these lines, may I repeat, I am not advocating a party policy, or a hasty policy. Many members of the Unionist Party talk as if the Stars will be diverted from their course, if they do not at once secure concessions from the Dominions for their manufactures, and as if nothing but a tax on corn can achieve what they want. On the other hand, many Liberals seem to have no conception of statesmanship, save to accept the Office-boy, who draws cartoons in the *Westminster Gazette*, as their political chief, and repeat his pale platitudes about bread.

Do either of these extremists really represent the views of Britannia? Britannia wants to know where we are going, and how we are going to get there. Britannia has been told that we are on the down grade, and wants to know where she can find a policy which will re-vitalize us, and enable us to play a worthy part in the future, in view of the immense

part which is unquestionably going to be played by our democratic cousins in the United States, the moment they have subdued the rude natural forces of that mighty Continent. From this point of view, Britannia knows that no re-vitalizing programme can be carried out as the result of mandates from the Mob, as the result of this election to-day, or of that election to-morrow.

It is to Britannia, therefore, rather than the politicians, that I submit the need for working towards an Imperial Ferry, and keeping the idea of it in our mind's eye, as one of the dominant ideas of the century. Let us do this, and the establishment of such a Ferry will be purely a question of time; nor can there be any doubt that, thanks to rapidly-increasing speed and cheaper rates, the day is within the compass of those now living, when *Pater Familias* will be able to take his family to Canada or South Africa, for the summer holidays, with the same facility with which, to-day, he now takes them to Scotland or Normandy.

To the Dominions belong youth and hope; to us who are nearer in touch with the ancients belong, together with their waning class prejudices, some, at any rate, of their culture, of their wisdom, and of that wider grip of principles and tendencies which cannot exist in young lands, where men have not often the leisure to study, or the patience to reflect. Surely a scheme for a cheap Imperial Ferry, which would enable the Canadian

in the harsh winter months, when there is little stirring, to spend a month or so amid the time-clad streets of Oxford or Chester, Edinburgh or Dublin : or would enable young Oxford to clear the academic cobwebs from his brain, by helping the boys out West to get in their harvest, is worth working for ! We, in this old land, who waste such prodigious energy over class rivalries, many of which America and Canada have wisely "scrapped," need to drink deep draughts of the windy optimism and cheery comradeship which whistles and laughs across their great plains. And you boys and girls out West, you settlers beneath the Southern Cross, or you Australian ranchers, may, now and again in your lonely lives, care to see faces from this historic Isle, and discover, over a pipe with some of us at your own firesides, how utterly those newspapers which traffic in the abnormal, fail to represent to you the habits, the customs, and the aspirations of your kinsfolk in the old country as a whole.

#### AGRICULTURE AND THE FUTURE.

Important as it is that we should effect devices for obtaining a certain abundant corn-supply from within the Empire—the need for a larger portion of land to be made arable at home is no less essential to our social and moral welfare. Do what we may to secure a new home market for our industries, we must not neglect the Mother of Industries—Agriculture. From this point of view, it



will perhaps be said, that the hatred of the Liberals against their old allies, the big Land-owning Whigs, is one that should be shared by the State-and-Church Tory ; and that heavy taxation, with a view to bringing big estates into the market, is what is required. For my own part, however, I cannot believe in this system of government by hasty attacks on the few by the many. What it seems to me we need, is the promulgation everywhere of the gospel of duty and whole-hearted self-sacrifice. Regarding the situation from this point of view, one cannot but hope that our Neo-Catholic Corporation will become a large land-owner, and, for social ends, will let certain farms at abnormally cheap rates, for the purpose of corn-growing and the employment of a larger proportion of the population upon the land. It is unanimously recognised that there are social and moral reasons why the Nation should not flock into towns, but it is more largely than anything a question of wages. The better the agricultural labourer is paid, the better his home, the bigger his garden, the larger the number of his fellow-labourers, and the nearer there exists a wage-earning handicraft for his daughters, the more liveable will village life become.

Because this is so, I cannot see that the self-sacrifice which will someday make the Church a big land-owner, which will encourage the Big Land-owner to behave, as regards rents, as if he were a mediæval Bishop, or the wealthy Farmer as if he



were a mediæval Abbot,\* is a self-sacrifice which should be promoted by Politicians. I cannot but submit that what we want, for these ends, is a higher type of public servant, in the form of Neo-Catholic Wardens, who shall regard our social ills, and all business questions, such as the tenure of land, as moral, if not religious, questions : to be undertaken and considered in the light of what *is right*, rather than what is politically expedient, or electorally "paying." And that is a view of the situation which will, I am confident, commend itself increasingly to the more thoughtful of our politicians themselves.

TRYING TO PLAY NATIONAL CHESS WITHOUT THE  
BISHOPS AND WITHOUT THE QUEEN.

And now, turning from the State to the Church, one might, perhaps, sum up the constitutional situation as it stands to-day by an illustration from the grand old game of chess—a game whose pieces illustrate the identical forces which have gone to the making of Western Civilization. And the reader who wishes to give a friend a brief summary of the case for Neo-Catholicism, could not do better than illustrate from the same source.

---

\* The mediæval Abbots were the first to free the serf on all Church lands. The wealthy modern farmer who behaves like a mediæval Abbot, will be one who makes the housing and just remuneration of his employees one of his chief concerns. Leadership and organization are vital to agricultural success, and it is on these lines, rather than abnormal devotion to the ideal of small holdings, that we shall surely revive agriculture.

Looking at the game of chess, we see distinctly what has been the weakness of our transitional Epoch from 1500 to 1900. We have been playing chess, or rather trying to play it, without the Bishops and without the Queen.

Why have we been doing this? It is a complex story, but I will try and put it as briefly as I can. Previous to the Reformation, and in the reign of Charles I., all the pieces—King, Queen, Bishops, Castles, Knights, and Pawns—were on the board, and the King could make moves, of all kinds, in a way that he cannot do to-day. In those days too, the Queen was eminently powerful, and by the Queen, I do not mean the King's wife, but the great idea of the Mother and the Child, which, under the form of the worship of the Virgin Mary and her Babe, had a most humanizing influence over our barbarous ancestors. The Castles or the Nobles were also immensely powerful, but their power was balanced by that of the Bishops,—*i.e.* a capitalized Church which owned a third of the land, and looked after, and did rough justice, to the serfs or pawns. For in those days, the Knights, or the House of Commons, were not of much account.\*

---

\* The Litany, for instance, which goes back to mediæval times, has no prayers for the House of Commons. It says simply, "We beseech thee to endue the Lords of the Council and all the nobility with grace, wisdom, and understanding."

Now, the history of the last three hundred years may be described as follows: In the interest of religious and civil liberty, our ancestors, at the Reformation and the Civil War between King and Commons, did three things. They limited the moves the King might take; they destroyed the worship of the Mother and her Child; or, if one might so express it, took the Queen off the Chess-board. At the same time, by destroying the bulk of Church Endowments, they practically took the Bishops off the Chess-board, and left only the Knights, the Castles, and the Pawns.

Since those times we have tried to play National Chess with nothing but the Knights (or the House of Commons): the Castles (or the House of Lords): and the Pawns (or the People); and of these three, by far the most important have been the Knights, whose value we have long over-estimated.

Our great object in doing this, has been to give the Pawns, or the working classes, civil and religious liberty: because every working man, like the Pawns in Chess, can, if capable, become a superior piece on the National Chess-board.

The result has been that efficient Pawns, or working men, have benefitted immensely, and have become self-made Men, Merchant Princes, etc., etc. The weakness of this procedure has, however, been the absence from the National Chess-board, of the organized Altruists, *i.e.* the Bishops and the Queen;

and to-day, under a modernized form, both must come back. Let us examine these two in detail.

1. *The return of the Bishops* (i.e. of Church endowments) to the National Chess-board. What is the advantage of this procedure? I cannot put it better than in the words of Disraeli, when in *Sybil*, he said that, so long as old Catholic Endowments existed, the poor had property on their side. To-day the poor have no property on their side, except Church Schools and National Schools. What we have to do to solve the Social Problem, is to create capital and property, which shall be on the side of the poor, and this we shall do, as I have shewn, by making a wealthy scientific Neo-Catholic Corporation the casual labourer's Landlord.

2. *The return of the Queen.* And now what do I mean by saying that for three centuries the Queen—the most powerful piece on the National Chess-board—has been absent? I mean a dozen things, which only the more imaginative of my readers will fully grasp to begin with.

You have, I doubt not, wondered how on earth the Mediæval Church acquired those voluntary gifts of which I have often spoken in these pages. To grip the real reason, you must picture to yourself our rude unlettered mediæval ancestors, under the sway of a Catholic religion which did, despite its limitations, exercise a gentle sway over the fiercest barbarian, in the form of the reverence which he learned to pay to the Virgin Mother and her Babe.



You need be no advocate of Mariolatry as needful in Western Europe<sup>(a)</sup> to-day; but, if you will only transfer yourself, in imagination, into the Middle Ages, you will perceive the immense strides which, up to the Reformation, woman made as a result, indirectly more than directly, of the picture of the divine Mother and her Babe, brought constantly before the minds of the men. The careers as abbesses, etc., which were offered to women by the Church of Our Lady, were also amazing; nor is there anything resembling it outside Christendom. If you patiently study Chaucer's Poems — or the delicate idealism of Spenser's *Faerie Queen*, and compare their general treatment of women with that of Homer, or Virgil, or with the general condition of women in the Old Testament, or the Arabian Nights, you will, I think, be startled out of your senses to discover the immense position which woman had come to hold by Chaucer's time. And you will surely not be far wrong, if you regard at least half of those voluntary Church Endowments, which were used to protect the weak, as results of appeals to the imagination of the rough Mediæval man, on behalf of the divine Mother and her Babe. You will understand how, with the idea of her divine aid, rough mediæval warriors rode forth and

---

(a) The immense strides which Roman Catholicism is making in India and Japan, makes it possible that the worship of the Mother and her Child will be the main factor in uplifting the Eastern Woman; and that from paganism through Paleo-Catholicism to Protestantism, will be the course pursued by the East as well as the West.



faced field and flood for the cause of chivalry, as Sir Walter Scott has told so happily, in his description of William of Deloraine riding to win the magic book for Margaret of Branksome, and fording the swollen river.

“ At the first plunge the horse sunk low  
And the water rose to the saddle-bow ;  
Never heavier man or horse  
Stemm'd a midnight torrent's force.  
But by stout heart and Our Ladye' grace  
At length he gained the landing place.”

It is, however, hardly too much to say, that, since the Reformation, the progress of womanhood has not been anything like so rapid. Queen Elizabeth and all the more important of the Ladies of her time were proficient in both Greek and Latin, and as accomplished as many of the men. But, in the interval there has been a decline in the rise of woman, due to the fact that there has been no practical Corporate Church to watch over her interests, maternal and civic.

It follows that one of the greatest—perhaps *the* greatest—factor in the Neo-Catholic Civilization of the future, will be the idea of the Mother and her Child taking, not the form of an idolatrous worship of the Virgin Mary, but the scientific, and none the less reverent, form of an attempt to create an environment for every Mother and her children, by making the Home the basis of Social Reform.

From this point of view, a new light is unquestionably thrown on the Suffragette Movement, and on the whole Constitutional crisis. And, as I recently read Mr. Asquith's speech at Bingley Hall, expressing the view that (expressed in terms of Chess) the Castles, or Lords, were the main foes to progress, and must give way to secure the supremacy of the Knights and Pawns: and, as I read how Mr. Asquith's observations were interrupted by the Suffragettes, I could not help saying to myself:—

“The Suffragettes are, after all, nearer the truth than any of us. Their clatter is the needful noise which the Queen is making: that Queen whom, for three centuries, we have locked up in the Chess-box, forgetting that she is the most powerful piece on the board, and that we cannot do without her.”

To minds which love to brood over the forces which have shaped the upward march of Humanity, the fanaticism which destroyed everything that the worship of the divine Mother and her Babe stood for, is amazing; and it is of curious interest to reflect, and note how traces of that fanaticism linger among us to-day.

How little does some luckless slum-dweller, as she eyes a prison-van rumbling along the street, and cries to a neighbour, “There goes *Black Maria*,” reflect how, centuries ago, cunning Parliamentary intriguers, who had plundered Church property,

taught the poor to give the name of "Black Maria" to the Mother of the Founder of Christendom! How little does such an one know that, for fifteen centuries, it was the gracious figure of Sancta Maria, with her Child in her arms, at many a way-side cross, which first taught the unlettered mediæval swain to doff his cap, and learn the rudiments of courtesy, chivalry, and respect, for the divinity latent in Motherhood. Nor can anyone, who stops to reflect, doubt, for a moment, that the idea which will dominate *social* statesmanship for the remainder of the century, will not be the bland figure of some assiduous M.P. standing on a platform, and promising to the Crowd a beneficence which will cost him, as Charles Dickens used to say, personally nothing. It will be the divine picture of the Mother of Britain and her Babe, living too often to-day, under conditions which ought to make us men blush for shame, asking us all, in accents that will find their way into the coldest hearts—

"What *voluntary* steps are you men, who claim to be sportsmen, taking to make me, as I *ought* to be, a Queen in my own home? What *voluntary* generosity are you displaying to guarantee that my children live in a Neo-Catholic environment which will enable them to make the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ, their attainable ideal, spiritually—morally—intellectually—and physically?"

OUR IGNORANCE OF THE SOCIAL ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE MEDIEVAL CHURCH THE ONLY REASON WHY WE DID NOT, LONG SINCE, ESTABLISH A NEO-CATHOLIC CORPORATION FOR SOCIAL SERVICE.

It is, indeed, because our countrymen to-day know about as much as ever will be known of the history of those Greek and Roman States which relied for their driving-force upon Taxation, but know so little about the amazing economic history of the old Catholic Church, which relied upon co-operation, self-sacrifice, and the ideal of the divine Mother and her Child, in the Dark Ages, when the coming of the barbarians had shattered the crude physical-force government of Greece and Rome (as the coming of individualism and machinery has, for nobler ends, shattered our Agricultural Constitution), that our social ills seem so insoluble.

It is they alone who have studied the history of Western Civilization, since that State System of Government by Officials, the Roman Empire, proved morally impotent, who know that, for fifteen centuries, it was propertied Catholicism and the principle of association in the shape of the Guilds, which led up to half that Goethe and Bismarck stood for in Germany, to half that Dante stood for in Italy, and to half that Shakespeare stood for in Britain.

They err, and err grievously, who suppose that our Reformation in the Sixteenth Century was merely the product of a revived study of Latin and



Greek. Obviously, this is only half the story. A new epoch, such as the Reformation, being manifestly half the product of new ideas and half the product of old. It was, indeed, at least half because, before the Reformation, those Christian principles, once the exclusive property of Monks and Nuns, had been diffused throughout the community that the period of the Reformation and the Renaissance were so glorious, and gave to Western Europe Freedom, arts, paintings, and a literature which have far and away transcended anything that was produced by either Greece or Rome. For, glorious as were the architecture, the sculpture, and the drama of Greece, and splendid as was the stately prose of Rome, the noblest of modern poetry, of modern art, of modern music, and of modern prose, transcend them.

For, despite the fact that, in the modern world, commerce and science seem often exclusively to have occupied the attention of the most fertile brains, the great artistic Geniuses of modern Europe have, with scarce an exception, crowned their work with a halo of spiritual aspiration, with a sense that there is something more in the world than is to be found in a merely physical philosophy, with a sense of "the light that never was on sea or land," and with a totally new feeling that the Golden Age which, to Greeks and Romans, lay buried in an irrecoverable past, is before us.\*

---

\* Saint-Simon.



If, for instance, at the Renaissance, Shakespeare gazed upon the past history of humanity with a new wonder, which was partly inspired by a study of the literature of Rome and Greece, Catholicism was the ladder by which he reached the heights. And if we ask what it is which accounts for the fathomless gulf which exists between Shakespeare and a Virgil, or a Homer, and why it is that so many of Shakespeare's characters move through history, as if transfigured, with characteristics which infinitely transcend the purely physical qualities which Greeks and Romans attributed to the immortal Gods on High Olympus, the most sceptical mind is compelled to acknowledge that, though, in Shakespeare's own words,

“Imperial Cæsar dead and turned to clay  
Will fill a bung and keep the dust away,”

it is due to those principles which entered the world with the Founder of Christianity, that Shakespeare was able to write such lines as the following—to which I invite closer attention than has yet been paid them. For they distinguish so clearly between the functions of the State and Church, of needful self-assertion, and self-repression:—

“The quality of mercy is not strained  
It droppeth as the gentle rain from heaven  
Upon the place beneath. It is twice blest ;  
It blesseth him that gives and him that takes  
'Tis mightiest in the mightiest. It becomes  
The throned monarch better than his crown :  
His sceptre shows the force of *temporal* power  
The attribute to awe and majesty,

Wherein doth sit the dread and fear of kings ;  
But mercy is above this sceptred sway,  
It is enthroned in the hearts of kings,  
It is an attribute to God himself ;  
And earthly power doth then show likest God's,  
When mercy seasons justice."

Both Greece and Rome went through those stages, through which Western Europe has gone. They went through an epoch when they were ruled by Priests. This epoch was followed by one wherein (like ourselves, in Tudor times, and Germany to-day) they were ruled by Kings, and this epoch was followed by a final epoch in which they were governed, as were all pagan peoples, nominally by Emperors and Senates, but practically by wealthy middle-class folk. Every pagan people, Rome, Greece, Egypt, Persia, Babylon, when it reached the stage when the wealthy townsman became its limp pauperizing ruler, fell like a house founded upon the sand. And the only power which can save the Nation in the West, which has been the first to reach that stage,

" When wealth accumulates and men decay,"

from a similar fate, is the revitalizing power of a Neo-Catholic Discipline which can, and will, treat wealth as moral manure, is a Church which can and will make wealth, and the leisure it brings with it, "the obedient and laborious slave of public virtue and public honour."\*

---

\* Burke.

DARING ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE CHURCH FROM  
1 A.D. TO 1500.

It is only because too many of us are ignorant of the economic achievements, during fifteen centuries, of a Catholic Organization, whose motto was Love and Duty, that it is rashly supposed that forceful State devices will solve the Social Problem. It is only because we are ignorant of the audacious economic triumphs—relative to the ignorance and depravity of the age—of the Catholic Church during fifteen centuries, that we suppose a kind of glorified improvement upon Aristotle's conception of the State, will make us a happy Nation.

Some babble, now-a-days, as if there was very little difference between society in Greece and Rome and post Christian society. The truth, as Mr. Kidd has so happily pointed out,\* is far otherwise. There were practically no social problems in Greece and Rome, for the simple reason that half the population of both Greece and Italy were slaves captured in war. Nor did the idea of bettering the life of such slaves enter into men's minds as one of the functions of pre-Catholic society.

In other words, there were no working classes, in our sense of the word, in Greece and Rome. If you can imagine that, after the Boer War, half the population of the Transvaal had been imported to Britain to work, as our slaves, on conditions implying that

---

\* "Principles of Western Civilization."

all their children were to be our slaves for ever, and that we, their masters, had power of life and death over them, you can acquire some conception of economic conditions in Greece and Rome.

A vast unfathomable gulf exists between pagan and modern society, and those who rashly suppose that Roman and Greek methods of Social Reform by force and taxation through "the State," are the methods whereby our Social Problem is going to be solved, are eternally wrong, and are fighting against the Stars.

They ignore, altogether, the part that Love and Altruism played when organized in the Middle Ages, through a capitalized Church, and in a diffused and alas! unorganized manner ever since. It was the Church which freed the serf in the Middle Ages, and it has been a diffused spirit of Christian generosity and good-will, which has done everything for the working classes since the Reformation, and which requires to-day to be embodied in a powerful Neo-Catholic Corporation. Nothing else will suffice.

#### THE RESPECTIVE LEGACIES OF CÆSAR AND CHRIST.

Not far from the place where I write, in the historic City of Bath, there stand two monuments of the past, side by side. First, there are our ancient Roman Baths, vast slabs of solid stone, which look as if they were built for eternity, to bear witness for ever to the wondrous physical stability which was



achieved, for so many hundreds of years, by the Roman State.

To me, at any rate, those Roman Baths stand for a conception of the State as it should be to-day and for ever; a strong massive creation which should make for physical stability, industrial efficiency, and imperial federation.

But when I see my countrymen assuming that Municipal and State Institutions, raised after the Greek and Roman model, by taxation, are going to save us from that materialistic gospel of free food, free education, free circuses, and free music halls, which, under a slightly different form, spelt, in the end, the downfall of both Greece and Rome; when I read your Fabian Society's sublime picture of the right-claiming millions of to-morrow, goading their wealthier fellows to Altruism, with the Task-master's whip of Taxation, killing the spirit of voluntary generosity, pinning their faith in Municipal Beer, and Municipal Baths, and crying, like Naaman the Syrian, "May we not wash in them and be clean?" my thoughts turn instinctively to the great Christian Abbey that stands beside those Baths, on the outside of which a mediæval designer, centuries since, traced two ladders and carved the figures of the angels of God, ascending and descending, between Heaven and men.

Gazing at that grand old Abbey and remembering all that the Christian Church, and the moral principle of self-sacrifice stands for—I turn contemptuously



aside from any and every attempt to apply a pagan plaster to a moral wound. For I remember that there were the most luxurious, though pauperizing, public Institutions for the poorest of the poor in declining Rome. I remember how the rich in Rome did no work, but lived on the wealth flowing in from the provinces, and how the poor lived on the rich. And I remember how Rome fell, and great was her fall.

Turning aside, however, from the ideal of "the State" and material self-interest, as typified by those Roman Baths, my thoughts turn instinctively to the great Christian Abbey hard by; and the font where the Christian child of to-day, as of old, is signed with the sign of the Cross of self-sacrifice, and is dedicated to fight manfully under Love's banner against Sin, the World, and the Devil. My mind turns instinctively to the Church Catechism, with its searching questions, not concerning rights but rather asking, "What is thy duty towards thy neighbour?" My thoughts turn towards the high altar where the Christian Church has striven for centuries, and is nobly succeeding, to transform that system of matrimony which, in Greece and Rome, was merely legalized desire, into the love of a soul for a soul.

IS IT FOR NOTHING THAT REMAINS OF THE MEDIEVAL CHURCH STAND SO OFTEN IN THE CENTRE OF MODERN TOWNS WHERE POVERTY IS MOST PRESSING ?

Is it for nothing, I ask myself, that in these

hustling days, those ancient spires point us heavenward from the very quarters of our towns where the problems of poverty seem most insoluble; or where the greed of some floater of unprincipled Limited Liability Companies works havoc in our midst, like the havoc of a Vandal Invader? Is it for nothing that these monuments of our mediæval Church are visited, year by year, by our cousins from across the Atlantic, and by Britons from beyond the seas? Is it for nothing that these wondrous remains of years gone by still possess niches—

“ Where dedicated shapes of Saints and Kings,  
Stern faces bleared with immemorial watch :  
Look down benignly grave and seem to say,  
‘ Ye come and go incessant, we remain  
Here in the quiet limits of the past.  
Be silent ye who flit and are forgot  
Of faith so nobly realized as this? ’ ”

No! My heart, intelligence, and faith, unite in answering that these monuments of an ancient Church stand in our midst to remind us that, as the greatest achievements of history, hitherto, have been the work, not of Plebiscites, or of States, but of one whose motto was Love; so too, in the future, it is to a gentle and a Christ-like Corporation, rather than through these yelping political parties, that we must look for moral progress henceforward.

The fullest reasons have been given as to why, after succeeding for fifteen centuries, the State and Church regime had to be temporarily abandoned

for three protesting centuries. For old Catholic endowments had come to be controlled in the unscientific South of Europe by Popes and Priests. But to-day the Church has rested and reflected enough. To day it is high time that she should awake from three hundred and fifty years of individualistic slumber, to become, once more, a Sister to the State and a Mother to the Nation: who shall effect by gentle, Neo-Catholic devices—at once Christ-like and scientific—that social justice which a Parliamentary war, between rich and poor, can never, never attain.

#### THE CLAIMS OF A NEO-CATHOLIC CORPORATION.

Shall we not equip her adequately, with land, capital and houses, in her new attempt to house the casual labourer, and secure fair play for the Mothers of Britain? Shall we not equip her adequately with shares, that, in due course of time, in conjunction with the Banks, she may moralize industry, and have the wherewithal to alter our whole conception of National Education? Shall we not equip her for a firm, but gentle, fight against the damning influence of three centuries of anti-Corporate environment? Shall we regard this Britain of ours, and all that it stands for, merely as if it belonged to us and to our children? Has that ancient Church which educated our Nation in its racial infancy, no claims upon our memories and our gratitude to-day? Are there not some, at least, among us, who, ere they go hence, and their voices are heard no more among us, shall remember the

enduring claims of the one National Institution we have left, and feel, with Longfellow that :—

“This spirit world around this world of sense  
Floats like an atmosphere, and everywhere  
Wafts through these earthly mists and vapours dense  
A vital breath of more ethereal air.”

“We have no title-deeds to house or lands ;  
Owners and occupants of earlier dates  
From graves forgotten stretch forth dusty hands,  
And hold in mortmain still their old estates.”

“Ah !” cries a reader, “You are but a visionary, and a dreamer, whose dreams will never come true !”

On the contrary, sir, such glimpses of the Neo-Catholic Civilization to be, as you may have caught in these pages, are merely the advance-guard of a Neo-Catholic Army, and I a humble outrider, spurring to secure quarters for the host in my rear. For I tell you that a day is coming, within the lifetime of the younger generation, when a wealth-owning Neo-Catholic Corporation shall, in social matters, tower, morally, above any political and self-interested Organization in our land, as surely as the Catholic spires of Westminster Abbey transcend the self-complacent grandeur of the Houses of Parliament, and as the grey dome of St. Paul's looks down, with proud patience, upon the gaudy splendour of the Stock Exchange. For so true are the words of Mazzini when he said :—



“Political parties fall and die: religious parties never die until after they have achieved their victory; until their vital principle has attained its fullest development, and become identified with the progress of civilization and manners. Then, and not before then, does God infuse into the heart of a people a new idea, vaster and more fruitful than the idea then expiring; the centre of faith is moved one degree onwards, and only they who rally round that centre constitute the party of the future.”

#### THE PARTY OF THE FUTURE.

“Ah!” cries Britannia, “and so you really mean that, in a sense, our present street-placarding Parties are doomed to disappear?”

In a sense, my Lady, I do. For the Liberal Party ceased to be a religious party when it had secured religious liberty; and, as your ladyship will agree, a day is dawning when, while still existing, our two House of Commons Parties will be overshadowed by two mightier National Institutions (a Neo-Catholic Church, and a State): and when the object of all who belong to the *Party of the Future* will be to do their duty (as our ancestors did, for fifteen centuries, down to the Reformation) to both Church and State, rather than chatter about their rights.

In submitting this, I do not, for an instant, imply that we should desire the great revolving doors of Destiny, ushering us into that new epoch, to do aught but move round slowly.



Looking back over history, and noting the vast evil as well as the good which has resulted from destroying corporate property at the Reformation, it is surely essential for us all to remember that a passionate and unscientific attempt to recreate corporate property, may land us in evils as great, if Neo-Catholic property be used to pauperize, rather than to discipline, the casual labourer and his family.

Miss Protestant Individualism was a lean and scraggy housekeeper, and her shrewish faith in Talk and Taxation rather than in the Mother and her Child has prevented us from utilizing the new forces of machinery, which entered our Constitution in 1760, for the benefit of all classes. But, in believing that the plump and kindly figure of Miss Catholic Collectivism is the sort of housekeeper that John Bull wants in this Twentieth Century, we must not forget that this warm-hearted and generous Lady has a somewhat dangerous tendency to get ready the fatted calf the moment she sees a tired tramp coming over the sky-line.

It is on this account that the word discipline occurs so frequently in these pages.

OUR FIRST AND MOST VITAL TASK MUST BE THE PATIENT CREATION OF A DISCIPLINARY ORDER OF SOCIAL WARDENS.

It is indeed the truth, that the chief need of our Neo-Catholic Corporation is a new Order of fully-trained Social Wardens. For we are to-day in the plight

foretold by Burke, when he saw that the old Catholic Orders of Social Workers—the Benedictines and Franciscans (though they had no modern machinery to humanize and uplift),—were Orders possessing discipline and devotion; which would make them admirable instruments in the hands of one who, to quote his precise words: *has long views: who meditates designs that require time in fashioning, and which propose duration when they are accomplished.*

Ardently as we may desire to make a disciplinary Corporation a Landlord, whose policy will stand for centuries, we look around us to discover, alas! that we possess no organized Order of either women or men who blend post-Reformation business ability with pre-Reformation discipline and devotion, and are hence fitted to undertake this great work. The Clergy of the Established Church—as Professor Lowell has observed—represent “a profession rather than an organization.”\* And the Archbishop of Canterbury was only too near the truth when he recently observed that “there were thousands of clergy in the fourteen or fifteen thousand parishes in

---

\* “The Church possesses organs so arranged and distributed as to imply a closely knit, if not a centralized, form of self-government; and yet those organs have so little power, either legislative or administrative, and the units are so independent, that for practical purposes the Church resembles a profession rather than an organization.”

(The Government of England. A. Lawrence Lowell,  
Vol. II., Macmillan and Co.)

England who certainly needed to go to school and learn from the outset the sounder principles of economic progress and social amelioration."

Turning to the earnest Nonconformist Minister, we observe that, unlike the Rev. J. H. Jowett, he accepts the State as the Engine of Moral Regeneration, and reserves for himself too often merely the functions of a Preacher, and sometimes merely of a religious Orator. General Booth's *Salvation Army* represents a modernized Franciscan Movement, full of devotion and self-sacrifice, but almost entirely devoid of post-Reformation business ability. For cohesion and discipline the *Church Army* is admirable: but its members are drawn too exclusively from one class, and lack the grip of finance, the knowledge of architecture, of the legal aspects of the tenure of house-property, of domestic hygiene, of sanitation, of Factory Acts, etc., all of which the Neo-Catholic Social Warden will have to know as thoroughly as the best of the mediæval monks knew the Vulgate, and the then most up-to-date methods of mediæval husbandry.

Something of the scientific spirit happily animates the Officials of the Charity Organization. But, while they possess much of the light which Matthew Arnold used to say was needed for solving social ills, it is to be questioned how far their methods are instilled with the "sweetness" and gentleness which are also necessary in those who would discipline the degraded. For moral discipline is not, surely, a

question of strangers probing too curiously into the unhappy past of a "wastrel." It is a slow patient process which wins his confidence and teaches him to regard his Social Warden as the stern, yet gracious Lawgiver, of whom Wordsworth sang :

"Stern Lawgiver ! yet thou dost wear  
The Godhead's most benignant grace ;  
Nor know we anything so fair  
As is the smile upon thy face :  
Flowers laugh before thee on their beds  
And fragrance in thy footing treads ;  
Thou dost preserve the Stars from wrong ;  
And the most ancient Heavens, through Thee,  
are fresh and strong."

It alas ! appears ungracious to submit these weaknesses in existing Social Organizations ; and certainly I am not justified in saying anything of others which does not rebound, like an ill-placed fives-ball, with heavier emphasis on my own head.

Nevertheless, it is not unreasonable to submit that a Nation which has been engaged in business for three-hundred years, and which is essentially a Religious Nation, will be able to create an Order of Social Wardens, who shall resemble that Father Dolling, whose religious earnestness none could gainsay, and of whom Lord Northcliffe none the less wrote : "He was among the very best men of business I ever met."\*

---

\* See "Life of Father Dolling," page 255.



Remembering the £7,700, in Church house-property of various kinds which Father Dolling built at Portsmouth, out of his own private resources, and those of his friends, in the form of a gymnasium, clubs, twelve almshouses, day schools, and a parsonage which was half a "hospital," it is surely not unreasonable to assume that a few thousand such Social Wardens, both men and women, fully trained (with the business men of Britain, and a Twentieth Century Reformation to aid them), could create an efficient Neo-Catholic Corporation, whose disciplinary efforts to do justice to the Wives of Britain, to all who are now sweated, and to the children, would win the respect of all classes, and ensure for their Corporation a generous support, in the form of voluntary gifts of land and houses, capital and shares.

IN QUIETNESS AND CONFIDENCE SHALL BE YOUR  
STRENGTH.

Fully confident that (with the aid of the ladies to inspire us) such generosity will be forthcoming; confident too that the Neo-Catholic Movement will not fail for want of joyful enthusiasm, the main idea with which I would close, is the idea that our great need is to recognise St. Paul's ideal, "In quietness and in confidence shall be your strength." For it is quietness that we, of this age, need most. It is silence, reflection, beauty, discipline, and light. We need more of the spirit in which Sir Francis Drake met the news that the Spanish Armada was



advancing, and declared that he had such quiet but confident faith in English seamanship, and the common-sense of the British people as a whole, that he and his friends could beat the Armada, and quietly finish their game of bowls as well.

The story is one which many bustling Reformers of our own time need surely to learn. It will not be by men who conduct business in the middle of the night, or who rage and tear about the country, that our Social Problems will be solved. It will be by hard-headed men, who deliberate before, and not after, they have dined; who want to know exactly where they are going before they start out; who prefer, in social matters, to walk before they attempt to run, but who, when they do get away, will do so in the joyful spirit which declares, "By my faith I can run through a troop, and by my God I can leap over a wall."

#### MAN'S SPIRITUAL ORIGIN AND DESTINY.

Finally, it should, in closing, be urged that, important as are the social aspects of its work, a conviction that man is a being with a spiritual origin and destiny, can alone give our Neo-Catholic Corporation that ability to work for posterity, to give much and to ask little, without which it will never, never succeed. And though there are many who will reply, that Science has deprived man of his faith, the day is not, I fancy, so very far distant when, on spiritual phenomena, Science, which in Darwin's works studied man's primitive physical

evolution, and which in these pages has attempted to appreciate some of those forces, such as the ideal of the Mother and the Child, which have shaped his social evolution, will also convince the most sceptical that there is a spiritual, as well as a moral and physical evolution proceeding in our midst, and that the psalmist was not, after all, so far short in detailed scientific accuracy when he wrote of the Spiritual Principle—

“Lord, what is man, that Thou art mindful of him?  
And the son of man that Thou visitest him?  
Thou madest him a little lower than the angels,  
And didst crown him with glory and honour.  
Thou, Lord, in the beginning, didst lay the  
    foundations of the earth,  
And the Heavens are the works of Thy hands.  
They shall perish, but Thou remainest :  
They all shall wax old as doth a garment,  
And as a vesture shalt Thou change them, and  
    they shall be changed.  
But Thou art the same and Thy years shall not fail.”

Let us, therefore, stand hard by our quiet faith in the spiritual principle, and we cannot go very far wrong. As at our Sixteenth Century Reformation, our ancestors, after the defeat of Popish Materialism, in the form of the galleons of Philip II., struck on a medal the ancient words—*He blew with His wind and the sea covered them*; so too, it is in Him that our faith must be placed, if our Twentieth Century Reformation, to rehabilitate Church property, on Lay-controlled lines, by voluntary gifts, is to suc-

ceed. And as around our coasts, after that defeat, many an Elizabethan school-boy, with his satchel,

“ Creeping like snail unwillingly to school,”

went out of his way to see, in the village Bay, the remains of one of those wrecked galleons, and on the beach, hard by, the bodies of the Spanish dead—and as, but a few days later, such an one went to his parish Church to sing a paraphrase of Israel's escape from Egypt, and realize the vivid truth how *God saved England from the hand of the Spaniard, and England saw the Spaniard dead upon the sea shore*—so too, may we hope that the children of to-day will yet live to hand down to posterity the story of an age, ere the middle of the Twentieth Century when it shall be said that *God saved England from the hand of Materialism, and England saw Materialism dead upon the sea shore.*

It will not, then, be by enthusiastic meetings, by eloquent speeches, or angry denunciations of the abnormally wealthy, that we shall do this. It will rather be by being slow to wrath, by letting bygones be bygones, by playiug steadily together like good sportsmen, each doing his daily duty and beating out the Materialism in his own heart, and through it all striving to observe, as our chiefest need,

“ The self-control that makes and keeps a Nation free.”

Anyone, therefore, who supposes that he will be serving the Neo Catholic cause by relying mainly upon his enthusiasm, will be wrong. Enthusiasm there must be and plenty of it, but it must be an

enthusiasm whereby a warm heart is capped by a cool head. And anyone who, either in the press or in the pulpit, wishes to elaborate the Neo-Catholic principles enunciated in these pages, would surely do well to remember that he should, at the close of all observations, send those to whom he is speaking or writing, away in a quiet, a collected and a scientific frame of mind. We do not want to make our Neo-Catholic advance in a hurry. We want a new basis of social reform—the home—and we want to advance from that basis like a quiet scientific intelligent army, and not like raving politicians.

It is of the children and posterity rather than of ourselves that we must think, and instead of shouting about the Neo-Catholic principle, we need rather to act in that quiet and practical manner in which persons accustomed to deal with children act, or ought to act. For the working men and women of Britain to-day are very much like children. They will do anything for people who really love them, and he is unstatesmanlike who, when delicate economic changes are to the fore, attempts to solve them by appeals to the anger of the ignorant, and does not rather endeavour, to the utmost of his ability, to mirror Shakspeare's ideal of a Statesman :

“Cromwell, I charge thee, fling aside ambition ;  
By that sin fell the angels—  
Still in thy right hand carry gentle peace  
To silence envious tongues. Be just and fear not :  
Let all the ends thou aimst at be thy country's  
Thy God's and truth's.”

Nor, as social reform mainly concerns the children could we perhaps do better than keep such calm ideals as those expressed, a century later, in Milton's *Ode on the Morning of Christ's Nativity*, in our minds, when writing or speaking on all these topics :—

“ It was the winter wild,  
While the Heaven-born child  
All meanly wrapped in the rude manger lies ;  
Nature in awe to him  
Had doffed her gaudy trim,  
With her great master so to sympathise :  
It was no season then for her  
To wanton with the sun, her lusty paramour.

Only with speeches fair  
She woos the gentle air  
To hide her guilty front with innocent snow,  
And on her naked shame,  
Pollute with sinful blame,  
The saintly veil of maiden white to throw,  
Confounded that her Maker's eyes  
Should look so near upon her foul deformities.

No war, or battle's sound,  
Was heard the world around :  
The idle spear and shield were high up hung ;  
The hooked chariot stood,  
Unstained with hostile blood ;  
The trumpet spake not to the armed throng,  
And kings sat still with awful eye,  
As if they surely knew their sovran Lord was by.



But peaceful was the night

Wherein the Prince of Light

His reign of peace upon the earth began :

The winds with wonder whist

Smoothly the waters kissed,

Whispering new joys to the mild ocean,

Who now hath quite forgot to rave,

While birds of calm sit brooding on the charmed wave."





14 DAY USE  
RETURN TO DESK FROM WHICH BORROWED  
**LOAN DEPT.**

This book is due on the last date stamped below, or  
on the date to which renewed.

Renewed books are subject to immediate recall.

3Jan'57HJX

REC'D LD

JAN 3 1957

LD 21-100m-6,'56  
(B9311s10)476

General Library  
University of California  
Berkeley

YC113497

M313156



